2nd COPY DELIVERED TO THE
JUN 7 1898
Library of Congress.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
BX4955
Chap. ..... Copyright No. .....
Shelf. B3
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

# CHRISTIAN SCIENCE
## AND ITS PROBLEMS

BY J. H. BATES, PH.M.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
MAY 26 1898

NEW YORK: EATON & MAINS
CINCINNATI: CURTS & JENNINGS
1898

TWO COPIES RECEIVED.
2nd COPY, 1898. 2M043

BX6955
B3

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON

7958

Copyright by
EATON & MAINS,
1898.

EATON & MAINS PRESS,
150 Fifth Avenue, New York.

# INTRODUCTION

"TEACHER, we want a sign from *you*." Thus the Pharisees set up their own Messianic standard. Casting out demons was to them a sign from hell. If he was the Messiah, they demanded a sign in the heavens. They had no use for truth that cut the cords of the mind, nor for sinlessness, nor for potent holiness, nor for love that reconciled the soul to God. He must shake the heavens with his power and fill them with his glory to authenticate his divine mission. Jesus "sighed in his spirit," and called them an adulterous and unbelieving generation.

Thus it has ever been—no "sign" within the circle of human life, no revelation of God in the natural working of the mind, no light of love transforming the spirit that shows us the face of Jesus Christ, has silenced the demand for prodigies of divine power. There must be some external manifestation of omnipotence, crushing through all natural law, to convince us that God is still alive. Hence natural phenomena have often been interpreted as miraculous, and the

Church for ages before the Reformation supplied the faithful with relics and charms and magic to maintain the "faith once delivered to the saints." The Protestant world, while rejecting relics, has often resorted to faith cure in its various forms as a substitute for Romish fetiches. When we insist that normal cures are proof that the salvation of Christ has its physical beneficence as well as its spiritual, that it corrects all human life, still the cry is set up for sudden violent displays of supernatural power, to the exclusion of the gradual processes of recovery which are in harmony with nature. The question may very justly be raised, Did God establish nature for the sole purpose of revealing himself by violating its order, or has he performed miracles that we might know him as the Lord of nature, the miracles being only a violation of "superficial uniformity in the interest of deeper law?"[1]

Christian Science is a form of faith cure so extreme that it has been invariably criticised as neither Christian nor scientific. It certainly is not in harmony with the fundamental truths of Christianity, and it wages ceaseless conflict with

[1] Gore, *Incarnation of the Son of God*, p. 50.

the spirit and results of all approved science. Hence, we cannot but regard the name as misleading and without excuse. To this "science" the laws of health are but a delusion and a snare; the study of physiology and hygiene cultivates mortal mind with all its repulsive offspring; matter is nothing; even the body is an unreality and false belief; sensation is an illusion because nerves cannot feel; all else is but a reflection of God, who is the only reality. Just what Mrs. Eddy means by reality she nowhere makes clear. It is hard to imagine the denial of the actual existence of material things on the part of one who eats with a relish, builds fires against the winter's cold, walks through the open doors instead of through the closed windows, and treats our present environment exactly as others treat it. It is much easier to suppose that by reality is meant enduring existence, which the scientist ascribes to God alone; but this would hardly account for the rejection of the conditions of our present life as *wholly* a "false belief of mortal mind." Her denial of the reality of the world of sense and experience is not only categorical, but it is also woven into the entire texture of her theory of

health, and with it her scheme must stand or fall.

This little book is an investigation of themes brought again to the surface by Christian Science. Statements of Christian doctrine will be found side by side with the principles of Mrs. Eddy's scheme. Truth has a self-evidencing power; it goes home to the mind with a native energy; it never returns to God void. I have therefore shunned all labored polemics while conducting this discussion in the interest of truth.

Controversy in these pages, however, is subsidiary to the search for health in the profoundest sense—health pervading the whole sphere of life; indeed, it cannot long continue anything less. A diseased imagination is inimical to a healthy stomach. Dyspepsia is a relentless enemy of a sound mind. Body and mind are most intimately related. We no longer divide man into compartments like a steamship. He is a unity with whom it cannot be well in any imaginary department of his being and ill with him in any other. Life is one, and the infraction of it at any point mars its harmony throughout. It is as essential that we should think clearly and love religiously

to be well in the best sense as that we should have a good digestion. The true physician is not a mere drug doctor. He who treats the sick must take into account psychic and ethical forces as well as chemical. Half the dissatisfaction with doctors arises from their obloquy to spiritual facts. They treat a fraction of a man, not his integral being. But this class of physicians is constantly diminishing as the knowledge of man increases. The study of the relation of mind and body is bringing new factors of health into view which the doctors are quick to appreciate. A new science of therapeutics will soon incorporate these psychic facts and forces, and once more the physician will find his nearest and truest coadjutor in the minister of the Gospel. In the meantime the laity, holding fast its faith in true science, may well avoid "the profane pratings and oppositions of falsely-named knowledge—which some professing concerning the faith have missed the mark!"[1] (1 Tim. vi, 20.)

[1] See Greek text, W. and H.

# CONTENTS


PAGE

I. The Immanence of God ..... 11

II. Life ..... 21

III. The Philosophy of Christian Science ..... 35

I. "Matter is Nothing" ..... 37

II. The Mortal Mind ..... 44

III. God ..... 48

IV. Fundamental Principles ..... 55

V. Science ..... 58

VI. Evil ..... 64

VII. Proof Texts ..... 75

IV. The Cures ..... 89

Christianity and Health ..... 121

# I

# The Immanence of God

# CHRISTIAN SCIENCE

AND

# ITS PROBLEMS

## I

### The Immanence of God

WHAT we think about God will determine all other thought. The universe from the view-point of pantheism or of deism is not the same universe that is seen from the view-point of Christian theism. To the pantheist there is nothing but God; to the deist matter is a reality moved by second causes, from which God is far separated; to the Christian theist God is more than the sum of all things, but he is very intimately present with all things, so that all energy is an immediate manifestation of God.

A true conception of God can be derived from neither pantheism nor deism alone. Pantheism dishonors the personality; deism, the omnipresence of God; to the one he is identified with the universe; to the other he is distinct from all things, and outside the world he has created; each has its lessons, deism emphasizing the

divine transcendence; pantheism, the divine immanence.

It is not surprising that a tinge of deism colors the average Christian thought of God to-day. In the third century Latin Christianity broke away from the more rational theism of the Alexandrian school, and began the development of a system of anthropomorphism which has very largely ruled theology up to a very recent time. God was supposed to be too exalted in his perfections to come into immediate touch with human life; hence a series of intermediaries—virgin, saints, pope, and priests—was placed between God and the soul. Theories of atonement and whole systems of theology were built on this conception, from which Christian Science is a symptom of a somewhat wholesome revulsion.

The thought of the Alexandrian school was more closely in keeping with God's self-disclosure as recorded in both the Old and the New Testament Scriptures. Clement of Alexandria said that God is in all human life; that he anticipated Christ and prepared for him through Greek philosophy, as well as through Jewish prophets; he was incarnated in Christ and through him in the whole human race; Christ had been in the world before he came in the flesh to prepare it for his visible advent; he was organically related to the human soul, hence "the image of

God in man is a spiritual endowment of humanity which is capable of expressing the inmost essence or character of God;" "the image of God in every man constitutes the warrant for believing that he may rise from the possibility into the actuality, that the image may develop into a living and speaking resemblance." The indwelling Deity, in Clement's view, is the educator of the race, the end of whose educational discipline is redemption.[1]

The biblical conception of God gave strong warrant to these views. Had not the psalmist said: "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in Sheol, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." Had not Isaiah declared, "We are the clay and thou art the potter?" and Jeremiah, "Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off? Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord?" And did not St. John affirm, "In the beginning was the Word, . . . without him was not anything made that was made. His life is the light of men . . . that lighteth every man

[1] *Continuity of Christian Thought*, p. 48.

that cometh into the world?" St. Paul also says, "In him we live, and move, and have our being;" and Christ taught the same great truth in his prayer, "That they all may be one, . . . even as we are one, . . . I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one."

Science has again brought into prominence the doctrine of the divine immanence. While it was possible to conceive of the world as a fabricated product at a particular period of time, it was also possible to conceive of God as a great mechanic, a carpenter, or a clock-builder, standing utterly aloof from his work; but the discovery that creation is a continuous process was attended by the self-revelation of the immanent God. Energy in its protean forms, force in its persistence, would admit of no definition that left God out. The only force we know in the last analysis is will; hence, if matter addresses us only through force, when we are dealing with matter we are dealing with the immanent God.

Philosophy teaches us to seek the unity of the world in God. Some form of monism, or the effort to reduce the world to a consistent unitary conception, has been almost universally entertained by philosophic thought. A fundamental pluralism is offensive to the reason. Interaction, law, system, demand a unitary being which posits and maintains them in their mutual relations.

"Is this one immanent or transcendent?" asks Professor Bowne. We might reply by asking for a definition of the terms. It would be absurd to take them spatially, as if immanent meant inside and transcendent outside; a fancy, however, which seems to underlie not a few utterances on this subject. The one cannot be conceived as the sum of the many, nor as the stuff out of which the many are made; neither does it depend on the many, but, conversely, the many depend on it. In this sense the one is transcendent. Again, the many are not spatially outside the one, nor a pendulous appendage of the one; but the one is the ever-present power in and through which the many exist. In this sense the one is immanent. The alleged impossibility of transcending the universe is another form of the same verbalism. In the sense defined we must transcend it; in any other sense there is no need of transcending it. In modern thought substantiality has been replaced or defined by causality. A world substance, as dintinguished from a world cause, is a product of the imagination which vanishes before criticism. For the explanation of the system we need a cause which shall not be this, that, or the other thing, but an omnipresent agent by which all things exist.[1]

[1] *Philosophy of Theism*, pp. 59, 60.

There is a happy accordance between this conclusion of philosophy and modern theology. The Deity of Latin theology is an otiose God—idle, at ease, contemplating his own glory. It is true that there are flashes of the divine immanence in St. Augustine and in many of his successors, but the tendency was to separate God from his world. On the other hand, present-day theology finds God in his world. Thus Dr. Charles Hodge says: "God fills immensity with his presence. His omnipresence is the infinitude of his being, viewed in relation to his creatures. He is equally present with all his creatures, at all times and all places. He is not far from any one of us. . . . Nor is this omnipresence to be understood as a mere presence in knowledge and power. It is an omnipresence of the divine essence. Otherwise the essence of God would be limited."[1] The words of Dr. Fairbairn are not less explicit: "If we believe in a living God, we surely believe in a God who lives; but God does not live unless he is every moment and in every atom as active and as much present as he was in the very hour and article of creation."[2] Professor Bruce, in his *Apologetics*, says: "To Christian faith the world is not a machine to which God stands related as an artisan, with which, the more it approaches

[1] Hodge's *Theology*, vol. i, p. 383.

[2] *Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 417.

perfection, the less he has to do. It is rather an organism of which God is, as it were, the living soul." An effective putting of the doctrine will be found in *Lux Mundi:* "Slowly but surely that theory of the world (the deistical) has been undermined. The one absolutely impossible conception of God, in the present day, is that which represents him as an occasional visitor. Science has pushed the deist's God farther and farther away, and at the moment when it seemed as if he would be thrust out all together Darwinism appeared, and under the disguise of a foe did the work of a friend. It has conferred upon philosophy and religion an inestimable benefit by showing us that we must choose between two alternatives. Either God is everywhere present in nature or he is nowhere. He cannot be here and not there. He cannot delegate his power to demigods called 'second causes.' In nature everything must be his work or nothing. We must frankly return to the Christian view of direct divine agency, the immanence of divine power in nature from end to end, the belief in a God in whom not only we, but all things, have their being, or we must banish him altogether. It seems as if, in the providence of God, the mission of modern science was to bring home to our unmetaphysical ways of thinking the great truth of the divine immanence in creation, which is not

less essential to the Christian idea of God than to a philosophical view of nature. And it comes to us almost like a new truth, which we cannot at once fit in with the old." [1]

It is important that we should understand the position of modern theology with regard to this fundamental doctrine. It has an important bearing on the development of a sound theory of life and health, and we shall see as we proceed how Christian Science diverges from it and loses sight of a personal God.

---

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 82.

# II

# Life

## II

## Life

NEITHER sickness nor death can be predicated of God, and if we may rely upon the analogy of nature, where variations from the parental form attain "survival values," and thus acquire a kind of immortality, we also may anticipate a time when we shall attain a deathless state. This is characteristic of nature's movement toward perfection—what is worthy to endure survives, and thus the whole life is exalted by the improvement of its individual factors.

Eternal life proceeds from a perfect correspondence between the soul and God. Death in nature is not annihilation; it is the gateway to life. This is the lesson of the tiny cell, the most primitive form of life, and it is a lesson constantly repeated in nature as we ascend the scale of being up to man. But at this point death acquires a moral function. What had been heretofore a natural force is appropriated by the moral order, and may now operate either as a blessing or as a curse. By man's abuse of life death clothes itself with terrors, and acquires a kind of punitive character. This shall all pass away when man has entered into perfect correspondence with God. True, death may still have a place and function

as the means of "disentangling this body, in which the old order ends, from the spiritual, in which the new order begins," but no longer will its face be clothed with horrors.

Man was made for life, and death is his servant. The whole movement of life from the beginning was toward a consummation in man. The appearance of a living cell in the process of creation, while it was a transformation of a startling character, was no violent break with nature. To it the nebulous mists looked forward with prophetic anticipation. The swirling fire-cloud began the preparation for it. Suns spread their dazzling beams; light gleamed on igneous rocks; wind and wave swept shore and forest; the mineral world bedecked itself with jewels; the mountains gathered their provident stores of fuel; and the subtle chemistries of nature made ready for the great event—the birth of a living cell.

But how shall we account for all this stir of preparation? Who gave this prophetic power to what we call the azoic world? And from whence came motion, that set the atoms dancing among themselves, that drove the winds from their fastnesses, that pulsed the tides of the great deep? Surely there was life here, though it veiled itself in all the forms of matter. There was life before the cell—a foreseeing, purposing, loving, and omnipotent life.

"In the beginning," says Genesis, "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Thenceforth the earth was no inanimate clod. The dry land appeared, vegetation, the inhabitants of land and water, and finally man, the consummation of creation. God made it all. But what was the method of creation? Genesis has no answer, save that it emphasizes the order and the divine origin of the sublime process.

Science carries us back to a microscopic cell, which it recognizes as the starting point of man. Here in the amœba he begins his race, his endowments, his acquisitions. Here he develops digestive power and the beginning of nerve tissue. Worms start the construction of his body in compact, definite form; fishes supply the spinal column, insects and vertebrates contribute the brain, and man lifts up his head the true Greek anthropos. But the mystery of this marvelous evolution grows deeper and darker until we recognize the immanence of God. The unfolding of the most rudimentary forms of life was a disclosure of God, who was still further revealed in each ascending stage until his image appeared in man.

There was then no gulf in nature between the first cell and its antecedents or consequents; it was the outcome of the world that preceded it, the parent of the world that followed. It, too,

was prophetic. It looked forward to higher unfoldings until it consummated in man. From the first movement of the macrocosm to the birth of the self-determining, godlike human mind there was a continuous manifestation of life, and man himself is its highest revelation. Like it, of it, in a sense, and yet apart from it, he still refreshes the streams of his life from God, whose presence has attended his existence in every form, and with whom he enters now into the most exalted relationship.

Thus we are a part of the universal life, from which we seek to separate ourselves by artificial partitions. It is indeed hard for us to enter into the abounding life of nature; we have given up so large a part of this world to dead matter and cold, blind force. To uncritical thought everything is lifeless save the scattered flora and fauna that appear upon earth's surface. The movements of nature are to us like the grinding of a great machine; every part stamped out like the wheels of a modern watch, impelled by "second causes," but God is not in it. This is the phenomenal world, beyond which we never think. We live upon the superficial crust of things. The real world lies beyond, and can be entered only by the mind. This is the occult, the noumenal world, to which our minds are directed by birth and death, by the instincts of our spiritual life,

and by all the lessons of religion. Once having passed the sphere of our own misconceptions and deformed creations, we find ourselves in the kingdom of life. Here there is no death. There is change, there is tropical movement, there is exuviation of the old things, but there is no cessation nor diminution of life itself.

We should have faith in life. Faith is the bond of union with God and is one of the earliest and most radical of soul powers. It is the power of the integral soul to see, the exercise of reason in the larger sense. It is knowledge, we may say, the highest knowledge, making constantly real to the mind what is not seen by the eye. The children of the forest witnessed to the earliest powers of faith. They never doubted a spiritual presence behind the forms of nature. Without questioning they accepted the power of invisible agencies over life. With them it was true that the instincts and intuitions of the soul exercised a much larger influence than the discursive reason. All the older religions bear witness to this fact. While Adam participated in the simplicity of life without questioning it was well with him, but when he sought to solve the mystery of good and evil, to make a world for himself, he was placed without the gates of paradise, and flaming cherubim forbade his return. He had entered the world of artificiality; he was

separated from life. The early history of the Aryans is a repetition of the same fact. Theirs was a submission to the simplicity of nature, to the current of its deepest life. Witness the following Orphic hymn:

"Render us always flourishing, always happy, O, household fire! Thou who art eternal, beautiful, always young, thou who nourishest, thou who art rich, receive our offerings with good will and give us in return the happiness and health which are so sweet."

The spirit of all this simple faith was finally paralyzed by the addition of religious rites. The Greeks enjoyed at first much of the Aryan simplicity and confident trust in nature, but each addition to their mythology, each new sect that sprang up, diverted the Greek life more and more from the channels of nature into artificial human trenches. The same course marks the early religious history of Egypt and Assyria. The humanly devised scheme of life covers up and stifles the soul. The whole course of Christian history is a remarkable illustration of this tendency. The art of Christ has been distorted and obscured by the artifice of the Church. Creeds, devised with ever so good an intent, and performing no little service in their way, have, nevertheless, hidden the simplicity that is in Christ. Weary of the problems of metaphysical

theology, of a benumbing scholasticism, we welcome the call of the age that turns us back again to the archetypal, historical, and immanent Christ. Not that we shall never come to see truth again in these integumentary doctrines which we now seek to strip off; not for a more confined view, but for keener insight and broader comprehension of religious truth, we now turn back for more intimate communion with the Christ of the ages. Thus the lesson is repeated; we must have faith—faith that sees and realizes the enduring truth; faith in the unseen, in both the universe without and that within ourselves, in nature; for with all our science we have not changed it; in the inscrutable forces that roll on without reck of time and that seek to carry us with them; in life, in God.

Shall we think without system? Surely not, for we can see system everywhere in divinely ordained nature. What is the earth but a system? What is man but a system? And so is every man. We are a part of a great system "which has skeleton and framework as well as blood and nerves; which has actions and reactions, mechanical as well as chemical; which has measures and compensations and coordinations and times and seasons, and whose gravities reveal its subtle attractions. This is the life which God has himself ordained, a life organic and

structural, which has system—nay, a series of systems—not only consistent in space, but successive in time." [1]

But the system must be flexible and subordinate to the life which it infolds. It must be capable of mutation even to submergence in a higher system. It is not system, it is not creed, *per se*, that has been the extinction of life, but rather the conservation of system as something of prime importance. Even the holy temple of the Jews became a godless structure when it came to be guarded by priests. That is a mistaken faith that clutches the material symbol instead of the thing symbolized. There is a somewhat, real and undiminishing, beyond all our human modes of expressing it, that is the true object of faith. It is God, and in him is abounding life in which by faith we participate, and that is the antithesis of disease.

It is mistrust and fear that have diseased us, and that largely maintain that disharmony from which proceed all our human ills. What is there of life to him who goes forth into God's world with a doubting heart? To such a one there is no peace with himself, no peace with man, with nature, nor with God. And more, he is a corrupter of men; he infests the community with his

[1] *God in His World*, p. 58.

deadly virus. Like an escaped patient of the pesthouse, he carries infection in his touch. Indeed, some such a leper must have stalked abroad through all communities, for how widespread is this leprosy of unbelief! How dark is the shadow it casts on every face we meet! With what a cuirass it loads down every man who goes forth into his self-imposed warfare! Could we expect health in such a world? It was a very ancient disciple of Æsculapius that advised cheerfulness as a cure for sickness. No intelligent disciple of any modern school of medicine has ever discountenanced his prescription. But how shall cheerfulness abound without faith? Is it the disciple of pessimism who has turned to be the apostle of hope? Surely faith in life is the wellspring of hope, of aspiration, and endeavor. He who enjoys the divine serenity of faith has entered on the way of health, and let him ever hold before his mind these words: Now abide these four, faith, hope, love, and cheerfulness.

Faith, again, gives us a true insight that saves us from the misleading of unsophisticated reason. Disease and death have a superficial appearance of terror, but faith sees that when they are not self-imposed they are not alien to life. If disease is only the natural integument of death, then it involves the whole process of life. We cannot move the body without the occurrence of both

death and birth in the muscular tissue. Every thought that goes burning through the brain is attended by death. It was death that ushered us into the world, and at each new stage of our progress the old and mortal coil has been shuffled off. Even before man appeared on the globe the preparation for his coming involved the dissolution of a countless series of organisms, and even the inorganic world for the same purpose produced and destroyed multitudes of beautiful forms. Death is not annihilation; to the eye of faith it is only the occultation of life, which reappears fresh and glorious. The entire future of man in all worlds is dependent on death—the angel of life.

Faith brings us close to nature without the imposition of our own interpretation of its meaning. Dogmatism is averse to life. It is the attempt to put life in a mold, to measure it by the conceits of the individual mind. It is the process by which each little mind makes a world for itself. Even the world that we call supernatural is too often a product of the human mind. Such perversions do not change nature, they only divert us still more from truth with what is unreal. A search in the simplicity of childhood for the true meaning of nature is healthful and life-giving. What, then, must be the consequence when we paint nature with the false colors of our own

mind. It is complacency in the perversion of nature that explains the use of certain drugs. Alcohol, morphine, cocaine, remove their victims as far as possible from the world of reality, and hasten a state of moritura. They are danger signals warning us to cast off every vestige of simulation, and to accept God's world as he made it.

All willful separation from nature is sin, because nature is one with our highest life. The movement toward spiritual perfection—indeed, toward all perfection—is profoundly natural. It is sinful to turn the balance of choice toward an inferior grade of life; it is a rupture with the immanent God, who is vitally one with all the genetic processes of nature, and is as necessary to man as to the crystal or the flower. To break with God is to cut the cords of life; to deny him is to lose the poise of soul. Sin is ethical disease, the root of all disease. Sin and disease are stern facts in this world, and either presents a subject too serious to be treated by magic. The image of God in man foretells possible rupture and conflict with the divine Spirit. Man is so complete in his structure, so distinct in his personality, that it is possible for him to resist even God. This is a luminous fact in human consciousness. No jugglery will ever deprive man of the conviction that he is the cause of the sin and moral evil

of the world. Returning to God again, like a wandering prodigal, drinking once more from the fountain of life, will be to mind and body re-creative and medicinal.

So far we have been considering the Christian view of God and life; Christian Science takes another view. Let us now inquire to what extent it is a perversion of the truth.

# III

# The Philosophy of Christian Science

## III

## The Philosophy of Christian Science

### I. "Matter is Nothing."

THERE is an inside and an outside to everything, and knowledge requires not only eyesight, but insight. The heavens spread before the eyes are not the astronomical heavens; they are only the raw material which the astronomer has mentally construed and interpreted. Thus in all the forms of matter the senses are first addressed, and then the mind draws its own inferences from the sense perceptions. But neither science nor philosophy denies anything which the senses give. What is discovered by sense is real, but it is not the whole of reality; it is the foundation on which rational thought builds up its system of reality. "However real the outer world may be, the mind can grasp that world only through the conception it forms of it."[1]

The concern of the mind is to find what is called the "universal predicates of the real in thought—that is, those predicates which all thinkers affirm under the same circumstances." This is what Ferrier calls "the common to all," and not merely "the special to me."

[1] For a luminous statement of this truth see James's *Psychology*, vol. ii, p. 635.

The following statements concerning the "nothingness of matter" are taken from *Science and Health.* They fairly represent Mrs. Eddy's position:

"The realm of the real is spiritual. The opposite of spirit is matter, and the opposite of the real is the unreal, or material. Matter is an error of statement. This error in the premise leads to errors in the conclusion, in every statement into which it enters. Nothing we can say or believe regarding matter is true, except that matter is unreal, and is therefore a belief, which has its beginning and ending" (p. 173).

"Not a glimpse or manifestation of spirit is obtainable through matter" (p. 66).

"The theories that I combat are these: (1) that all is matter; (2) that matter originates in mind, and is as real as mind, possessing intelligence and life. The first theory, that matter is everything, is quite as reasonable as the second, that mind and matter coexist and cooperate. One only of the following statements can be true: (1) that everything is matter; (2) that everything is mind. Which one is it?" (p. 166.)

Mrs. Eddy's conception of matter has very little affinity with idealism, whether it be a true idealism that has a deep and genuine respect for the natural order and for experience, or with a subjective idealism like that of Fichte. With him

matter was the condition of our common tasks, something that each one creates for himself, but also in common with others. It is a real product of the mind, although not real in itself. Without it we dream; we are delirious because we cannot work in common, and hence we cannot be effectively righteous. For this reason some have thought that Fichte's system might better be called "ethical idealism in its extremest expression." But it will be noted that, while Fichte insists on the necessity of a sense world as a common mental creation, the condition of ethical activity, Mrs. Eddy denies the reality of such a world, and describes it as a delusive fiction, a product of mortal mind.

There is, again, a wide divergence between her teachings and those of Spinoza, who calls the material world body, or bodily substance, and the inner world of thought thinking substance, or mind. These two worlds were to him "equally real, equally revelations of the one absolute truth, equally divine, equally full of God."

Berkeley has been charged with a philosophical idealism that denied the reality of matter, and of him Byron wrote:

> "When Bishop Berkeley said there is no matter
> It was no matter what he said;"

and yet the famous idealist contended only for the doctrine that matter has no reality *apart from mind.*

Thus it appears that when Mrs. Eddy asserts that "matter is nothing" she stands alone. Her *dictum* arises from the exigencies of her scheme of mental healing. Matter is denied reality, not because reason requires the denial, but because disease and sickness are supposed to inhere in matter, or in the mental conception of it, and with the disappearance of the one the other, also, is banished.

When Christian Science affirms that matter is nothing it denies a predicate of thought of universal validity. The reality of matter is not solely a deliverance of sense; it is also a determination of the mind. The senses may give an imperfect or superficial report of matter, but when the mind interprets that report it determines for us the highest possible reality of matter. It therefore cannot be affirmed that objective matter is "a sham, a mockery, an illusion, or even a lie; it is a revelation."

Philosophers now generally agree that matter cannot be defined as substance in the sense of self-existence. God only is substance. Hence the theory that atoms are discrete entities, which underlies the materialistic view of the universe, is gradually giving way to the energistic theory which speaks of matter in the terms of energy. It is true there is no passive matter in itself; nor is it possible to conceive of force in itself as

separate from its activity. Matter is a manifestation of force. Thus Professor Ostwald, of Leipsic, says:[1] "The supposition that all natural phenomena can be traced back primarily to mechanical factors cannot even be designated as an available working hypothesis." "The predicate of reality can be applied only to energy."

If it be true that energy is known to us as a living will, then matter is a revelation of God, but not in any sense that negatives its reality. Chemistry will justly continue to treat of atoms and the formation of molecules, but we cannot rationally follow the teachings of chemistry without thinking of God.[2]

Three tendencies have become marked in the course of the history of thought. The one is that of pantheism, which makes God all; the other is that of panegoism, which makes the soul all; finally, panmaterialism declares that there is nothing but matter. This is the contradictory of the error that matter is nothing. The truth seems to be in the recognition of matter as a middle term between God and the soul. The reality of the soul, God, and matter is a spontaneous faith, necessarily incomplete, often intellec-

[1] *Popular Science Monthly*, March, 1896, art. "Failure of Scientific Materialism."

[2] Bowne, *Metaphysics*, p. 303.

tually latent, but so universally prevalent that it falls into the classification of what Ferrier calls "the common to all." Undue emphasis on either one of these terms unbalances life, which is only good and happy in proportion to the due practical acknowledgment of all the three.

Matter as the middle term between God and the soul is the medium of the divine self-revelation. The relation of the soul to the body is a figure of the relation of God to the world. He is incarnate in matter as the soul is incarnate in the body. In the presence of external nature we are in a condition "which is in analogy to that in which we are when beside a human being who is speaking to us, or otherwise making signs that enable us to enter in some degree into his thought." Thus the soul knows and communes with God through matter.

In its search for unity the soul does not cast matter aside and find reality only in God. Monism is a demand of the mind, but this demand is not satisfied with a "one-substance" theory. It requires only a "unitary or consistent conception of the world." Such a "consistent conception" requires that we should not attempt to think of either God or man apart from matter. We are confined to the data of experience. What may be possible under conditions other than those of our present existence we do not know, but in

the world as we find it three realities, God, matter, and the soul, are merged in an harmonious unity.

There is no evidence that we shall ever exist apart from matter. Existence as pure spirit is inconceivable. The anticipation of purity of soul, as a result of its separation from matter at death, is based on the false notion of matter that characterized the ancient heresy of Manicheism. Matter is not evil; it is not something to be got rid of; it is not "a false belief of mortal mind," the source of our human woes. It must, however, be interpreted in truth before we can enjoy harmonious life. Christian Science denies matter, and hence, whatever may be its immediate effect, it must ultimately produce discord and disease.

## II. The Mortal Mind.

There is no life save in *God's* world. A humanly devised world is more barren than the igneous rocks. That the human mind must construe the world is evident upon a moment's reflection. The mind depends upon media for its communication with the world. A bell is tolling in a distant tower; the metal vibrates, atmospheric waves are set in motion; they reach the ear and excite the nerves; the nerves extend to a certain brain center, where a record is made of the nervous excitation. Thus the mind depends on the media of atmosphere and nerves for the phenomena of sound. But the subjective interpretation must correspond to that of every other normal mind. To construe sensations so as to derive false mental products is to create a fictitious world.

Still it remains true that the world to each of us is mental. "In the interpretation of the external world we rationalize our sense perceptions, or we reduce the order of impressions to the order of thought. Not only do we interpret each sense impression, but we combine the interpretations derived from all the sense perceptions into a unitary conception. This is our world. The process of interpretation, however, will be somewhat modified in each individual mind by heredity,

environment, and education, so that the result may differ more or less from reality. Is there, then, any real external world? Is not the world in each mind the only world?

This is a question raised in the interest of egoism, or the doctrine that there is nothing real but the soul, and amounts to the affirmation that the mind may construe the external world in contempt of every sound mental principle. Over against such fantastic imaginations science gives us an ideal structure which experience vindicates. "A clear distinction is recognizable between the 'work of the mind' which is my own arbitrary production, and that which is not, between mere ideas and scientific truth. . . . Knowledge, therefore, is knowledge, and scientific truth is truth."[1]

The Christian Scientist insists on constructing his own world. He rejects all science and all rational conclusions of the mind, and builds a little world within himself according to his own arbitrary principles. He enters on a life of self-deception, which he inveterately maintains, a kind of mental aberration which should be impossible. He affirms that matter is nothing, although he employs it for food and clothing, and in all respects treats the external world like other men. Thus in the cultivation of mental delusions he enters a life of unreality, full of contradictions,

[1] Green, *Philosophy*, p. 41.

which can ultimate only in deterioration of the mind. When he has cast out the "mortal mind" his last state will be worse than the first. The resultant will be a mortal mind of very small capacity.

Christian Science is a bad form of bigotry. The scientist assumes to know the truth, the exact truth, the whole truth. *Science and Health* is his text-book and Bible supplement. He is not and cannot be in touch with any other system of knowledge. Science to him is but a product of mortal mind. He can receive light only from his own source. That cannot be questioned. The system is nonexpansive. It is like cast iron—it will break before it bends. It can absorb nothing. The mind of its author indurated it at birth.

Hence the scientist must ever hold others in haughty contempt, nor dare he have an inquiring mind. He must shun all books but his own, and all men but those of his own coterie. "We weep because others weep, we yawn because they yawn, and we have smallpox because others have it; but mortal mind contains and carries the infection. When this mental contagion is understood we shall be more careful of our company; and we shall avoid the loquacious tattler about disease as we should avoid the advocate of crime."[1] This principle the scientist applies

[1] *Science and Health*, p. 47.

very generally. He must close his mind to the talk of the thoroughfare, and guard himself in passing the time of day with a neighbor. It would never do to say, "How do you do?" or, "Are you well to-day?" This would be a fatal recognition of the claim of mortal mind. For him there is nothing but exclusiveness and self-infoldment.

## III. God.

The assertion that God is "principle," and not personal, is fundamental in Mrs. Eddy's scheme. And yet she says, "God is personal, in its scientific sense, but not in any anthropomorphic sense." That is, we must not ascend to the knowledge of God from the knowledge of man. "He is divine principle, supreme and incorporal being, mind, spirit, soul, life, truth, love." These terms, she says, are synonymous, and we are left to infer that there are no shades of difference in their use. Spirit and soul are identical, so also are soul and truth. The thought of God will permit of no concrete expression; abstract terms are its only exponent. But abstract terms have little value in satisfying man's religious need. The noblest imagery is that which describes God in terms of man. God's hand and eye and heart portray relations of his Fatherhood to us. True, such terms may convey only imperfect conceptions of God to the mind, but they cannot be abandoned while we remain what we are. "Thus always men have imagined the divine after the human pattern; it is an inevitable idealism, and if it be the greatest of illusions, it is one luminous with all the light there is for us in the present order of things." The transcendence of God thus takes tangible form in the mind, and "without the

transcendent relation of God, and our consequent obligatory relation to him, all cultus shrinks into mere subjective emotion and sentiment."[1]

This indeed is what becomes of Mrs. Eddy's scheme. She probably intends to avoid pantheism, but she leaves very little room for the divine transcendence. She declares that God is all, but this is not equivalent to the proposition that God is more than the sum of all things; conversely it ends practically in the identity of God with all things. Thus she says, speaking of man: "The science of being shows it . . . impossible for man to be a separate intelligence from his Maker" (p. 205); "The soul or mind of man is God" (p. 198); and again: "The term souls, or spirits, is as improper as the term gods. Soul, or spirit, signifies deity, and nothing else" (p. 462). It is hardly possible that such language can be construed in harmony with a consistent theism.

Let us consider what we mean by personality. I am a person—that is, I have power freely to determine myself. I possess reason and can weigh motives, in view of which I can direct the moral course of my life. The substance of my being I discover in my identity; I am the same person I have always been. I have desires that reach beyond the mere acquisition of material things, and will not be satisfied until I have found an-

[1] Sterrett, *Studies in Hegel's Philosophy*, p. 55.

other person as an end of life, an end in which my entire personality may rest. Thus the element of love appears. It is the very self that loves, and what I love in others is personality like my own. Of all these facts I am conscious; and thus self-consciousness is at the base of personality. No philosophy can deprive me of these elements of personality, nor invalidate this source of knowledge. It is not more true that "God is all" than that I am a person; and if it is true that "God is all," the fact must be interpreted in the light of my personality. It is useless to assert that the infinite cannot be measured by the finite, for whatever truth the assertion may contain it remains equally true that the reality of the infinite cannot do away with the reality of the finite. "In him all finite things find, not lose, their reality. . . . All things in God does not mean nothing but God." [1]

The only conception that I can form of God is that he is a personality like myself. If he were less a personality than myself, then I should be greater than God. All that is essential to myself I know is also essential to the divine Being. In him reason, will, and love come to their perfection, and he must self-consciously possess these elements of personality. It is on this very fact that our faith in this universe reposes. It is a

[1] *Studies in Hegel's Philosophy*, p. 23.

trustworthy universe because such a God is its ground. "If the term 'person,' as distinguished from 'thing,' is taken as the one term which especially signalizes moral relation among beings, and which implies moral order, as distinguished from merely mechanical or physical order; and if the universe of reality, in its moral principle, must be treated as an object of moral trust, when we live in obedience to its conditions, does not this mean that it is virtually personal, or revelation of a person rather than a thing—an infinite person, not an infinite thing? If our deepest relation to it must be ethical trust in perfect wisdom and goodness or love at the heart of it—trust in its harmonious adaptations to all who are willing to be physically and morally adapted to it—this is just to say that our deepest or final relation to reality is ethical rather than physical; that *personality* instead of *thingness* is the highest form under which *man* at any rate can conceive of God. This is the moral personification, or finally theistic conception, of the universe of experience."[1]

In order to satisfy the mind's demand for personality at the base of the universe it is not necessary that we should suppose that God draws conclusions from premises as we do, nor that he should exercise the power of memory. This would be anthropomorphism to the extent of mak-

[1] Fraser, *Philosophy of Theism*, vol. ii, p. 149.

ing God a man. The conception of God as an old man sitting at his desk in the skies, and scanning human actions and the general on-going of the world, or as a king in his far-off palace with his court assembled about him, is repulsive to Christian thought. The personality of God in no way carries with it such a conception. But the definite thought of personality came as a growth, and from a most rudimentary beginning proceeded stage by stage with the progress of the race until it became one of the most sublime cognitions of the human mind.

Here, then, are two personalities separate and distinct, God and myself. This is knowledge. It avails not to say with Mrs. Eddy that the "soul is God" and "God is soul;" "There are no souls." Whoever makes such an assertion must face the fact that everyone knows himself to be a person.

But if it is true that I am a personality distinct from God, can I antagonize God in my personality? Mrs. Eddy asserts that I cannot, else God would be the creator of evil. Logic, by the way, avails little against the facts of consciousness, and no fact of consciousness is more universally attested than the power of self to resist God. The force of this fact Mrs. Eddy attempts to evade in her doctrine of the *mortal mind*, "nothing claiming to be something," itself a nonentity imagining

error to be real, "belief that life, substance, and intelligence are in and of matter." She would make it appear that such antagonism is not in the real self, but in a kind of fictitious appendage of the real self. This, however, is not the fact of consciousness. No fact is more profound in the mind than that the real antagonism to God is in the heart of selfhood. It resides not in thought or action, but in will.

How does this fact of sin make God the author of evil? That God cannot create evil is a fundamental axiom with Mrs. Eddy. But cannot he create the conditions that make evil possible? Was man necessitated by his creation to be God-like? If so, how came the mortal mind? The answer is, through the fall. But if the mortal mind came through the fall, why not real antagonism to God? It is interesting to note that while Mrs. Eddy smuggles in the fact of the fall, she gives no rational account of it. Mortal error was somehow supposed to exist apart from man, who was the reflection of his Maker, and by some subtle power insinuated itself into human life. Then we find the divine reflection obscured by mortal mind. How came this marvelous change? It will be observed in Mrs. Eddy's teaching that there is no place for free will. The original man had no power to change himself any more than the reflection of a man's face in a mirror can

change itself. God did not create mortal mind; how, then, did it come to becloud the image in the mirror?

We cannot ignore the power of free will. God did create man a free, self-determining personality, in whom was lodged the possibility of a warfare between the lower and the higher life, an antagonism to God. The only life consistent with man's existence is one of harmonious ethical relation to God.

## IV. Fundamental Principles.

*Science and Health* is a tissue of incoherent speculations, tied together, if we may allow so much, by the following propositions:

"1. God is All.

"2. God is Good. Good is Mind.

"3. God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter.

"4. Life, God, omnipotent Good, deny death, evil, sin, disease.

"Disease, sin, evil, death, deny Good, omnipotent God, Life."

The book itself is supposed to be a defense and exposition of these fundamental propositions, but it is an iteration and reiteration of them, the object of which is to prepare the way for mental healing. Disease is supposed by the mortal mind to reside in matter, which must therefore be shown to be nothing. God is now all that remains, and as God cannot be diseased, there can, therefore, be no disease. The first in the series is radical to the system: "God is All." But we have shown that God is not all in any sense that would exclude the personality of man. Disharmony with God is a fact of human consciousness, and from disharmony come evil, disease, and death.

Mrs. Eddy seems to labor under confusion of thought concerning matter. First, she misrepresents the view of matter taken by science. For

example: "Matter is sentient" (p. 180). "Mortal belief, misnamed man, says matter has intelligence and sensation" (p. 180). "That matter is substantial, or has life and sensation, is one of the false beliefs of mortals" (p. 174). "Mind, not matter, is the Creator" (p. 152). Thus she charges that those who believe in the objective reality of matter claim that matter is sentient, intelligent, living, and a creative power. It is impossible to apologize for such misrepresentations. Secondly, she assumes that it is currently believed that matter is antagonistic to God, the very seat of evil. On the contrary, both philosophical and theological thinkers regard matter as good, not opposed to God, the ground of the divine self-manifestation.

The denial of matter carries with it the most preposterous conclusions. Thus she remarks: "We say the body suffers from the effects of cold, heat, fatigue, etc., but this is belief and error, and not the truth of being, for matter cannot suffer; mortal mind alone suffers, and not because a law of matter has been trespassed, but a law of mind." Cold can have no effect, therefore it is not necessary to dress warmly and to have fires in winter. You may thrust your hand in the fire with impunity. Poison may be eaten like sugar; sanitation and hygiene are of no avail; dirt on the skin is matter in the mortal

eye; and much more of the same sort if matter is nothing. It is a very common resort for teachers of this class, when the absurdity of such teaching is exposed, to claim that it is an esoteric gnosis. "Can you understand this?" she says to Rev. Stacy Fowler. "No; and no one can fully until I educate the spiritual sense to perceive the *substance* of spirit and the substanceless of matter." Thus the "common to all" is not real, only the "special to me."

A specimen of her logic may be found on page 7, where she says, "There is no pain in truth and no truth in pain." This proposition is intended to affirm that there is no reality in pain because there is no pain in truth. Let it be noticed that the terms of this inversion are not univocal. As soon as we give truth the same meaning in both members of the inversion the fallacy appears in the light of all experience. Distribute the term truth as in the following proposition: *Some truth is very painful.* Remorse can hardly be described as a delusion, and the mind that knows remorse knows pain.

Thus a tissue of assertions constitutes the buttress of her fundamental principles, and from them to conclude that "God is all," and that therefore death, evil, sin, disease are unrealities, is to require a dangerous stretch of reason, and to mistake quicksand for "principles" upon which she builds an ambitious and revolutionary system.

## V. Science.

Kepler, when he read the laws of the heavens, exclaimed, "I think thy thoughts after thee." This is the delightful service of all science—it interprets the intelligence in nature. There is a certain affinity between man and his surroundings, and the ground of that affinity is intelligence. Reason in nature invites man to the work of interpretation. Science is the response of reason to reason. Man can no more suppress the scientific faculty than he can suppress the activity of his mind. His first questions are addressed to nature, and it is nature's secrets that he is ever trying to unravel. Science is not a scheme of the human mind imposed on nature; it is the discovery and elucidation of what is already in nature.

It is therefore fundamental to science that it should deal with facts—that is, with individual actualities or realities as an atom, or a force, or a law of nature. The fact must be such as can be verified through the channels of observation, and the verification of the fact is of vital importance to science. But facts should never be considered individually exclusive of their relations. "The world is not a collection of individual facts existing side by side and capable of being known separately. A fact is nothing except in its rela-

tions to other facts; and as these relations are multiplied in the progress of knowledge, the nature of the so-called fact is indefinitely modified." It is the work of science to trace out these relations, and not only to discern clearly and completely the discrete fact, but also to define its connections and discriminate the system of which it is a part. Science is thus a legitimate process of analysis and synthesis.

Let us take an example of a fact: Food will nourish the human body. This is a fact. Let the doubter try to live without food. In nourishing the human body certain particles of food are carried to the bones, other particles to the tissues and nerves. How do we know this? Because we find that the constituents of the body are contained in the food; the involution must be equal to the evolution. Christian Science is powerless to change this fact. If a child's teeth do not form normally, the addition of phosphates to its food will hasten the process of dentition. This is a very familiar fact. An acid is a fact, so also is an alkali; it is also a fact that they will combine with a neutral result. The theory that "matter is nothing" cannot annihilate these facts. Carbon and oxygen are facts; it is also a fact that they combine in the production of heat. The Christian Scientist never builds a fire by putting coals in the grate and then excluding the air. It

is a fact that the nutrition of the system depends on the circulation of the blood, by which the particles of food are carried to their appropriate destination. It is a fact that the circulation of the blood depends largely upon the contractile power of the heart. Facts like these find a true classification in a system of physiology and hygiene.

There is an evident value of knowledge thus classified. From chemistry we learn that carbonic acid gas will extinguish fire. Hence the chemical fire extinguisher. From the science of electricity we have learned to light our streets and propel our cars. The science of pneumatics has given us the locomotive. Optics and chemistry have given us photography; indeed, modern civilization is the gift of science.

Science, however, has passed through a slow and laborious growth. Its origin may be traced to man's first reflection on the phenomena of nature. The Babylonian priest, in his silent watch-tower, aided only by the natural eye, laid the foundation of astronomical science. The Egyptian also knew something of astronomy, and much of geometry, and made considerable progress with chemistry and metallurgy. Physics, chemistry, and physiology were studied by the Greeks, and everywhere in the ancient world the feeling was awakened that the study of nature must ultimate in the mastery of nature. The

noblest minds that have graced the human race have partaken of this feeling. Aristotle, Hippocrates, Paracelsus, Galileo, Bruno, Kepler, Newton, Faraday, and Helmholtz have struggled with the mysteries of nature, and have sought to make science conform to a system of true and certain knowledge.

Shall all this splendid product of the noblest minds be put aside as of no worth—as "a false belief of mortal mind?" If not, why not? Because it deals with and rationalizes facts that underlie all life. To dispense with science is to dispense with rationality.

If science is true—chemistry, astronomy, botany, for instance[1]—then the sciences of anatomy and physiology must likewise be true, because they rest on observed and classified facts. If anatomy and physiology, why not pathology? Are not the facts of abnormality as patent as those of normality? Is not a cataract on the eye as much a fact as the crystalline lens? Is not a lesion of the valves of the heart as much a fact as the heart itself? If these are facts, why may they not be studied and classified?

What is the difference between the mind that discovers and classifies pathological facts and the mind that attends to the facts of chemistry and astronomy? The same mental faculties are

[1] *Science and Health*, p. 82.

brought into operation in discovering and classifying the facts of pathology as in dealing with the facts of chemistry. Why should one be the product of mortal mind more than the other?

This is the justification of medical science. Like all science, it should not be estimated by its results, but by its methods. Medical science aims at the interpretation of nature. It deals with a certain class of natural facts which solicit investigation just as much as the facts that are included in geological science. If medical science is put without the pale of legitimacy, so must all science submit to the same exclusion. Such a course is an act of self-stultification, which is impossible to the normal mind. It may be true that medical science limits its sphere far within its true bounds; there may be facts belonging to it that are left unconsidered; but this in no way disqualifies it as a truly rational procedure to the extent that it carries research. It might have profounder comprehension of its facts were its field enlarged, but its methods must be accredited whatever its defects.

Christian Science, on the other hand, denies facts. It refuses to clearly determine facts or to classify them, hence it rejects the methods as well as the conclusions of science. In so doing it abandons rationality and seeks to destroy the foundations of civilized life. The fantastic im-

aginations which it calls knowledge are brought forward as a substitute for the scientific conclusions of the human intellect, and this the world is informed is *Christian* Science. The wonder is that Christianity has been able to endure the repetition of such caricatures from age to age.

## VI. Evil.

"Evil," says Principal Fairbairn, "is a philosophical term, and denotes every condition, circumstance, or act that in any manner or degree interferes with complete perfection or happiness of being, whether physical, metaphysical, or moral."[1] Christian Science defines evil as unreality —that is, the opposite of divine order. Let us inquire how far this is a correct representation.

We will begin with physical evil. Opening the Bible at Isa. xlv, 7, we read, "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I am the Lord, that doeth all these things." If this is a protest against Persian dualism, it explicitly affirms that God creates physical evil. If, on the other hand, it means that "peace" is that happy state to which Israel should be restored, and "evil" is the exile, the affirmation is not changed because the exile was physical evil.[2] How far, then, do we find the declaration of the prophets, that God is the cause of physical evil, verified by historical fact? Science teaches us that the first men endured privation and suffered from exposure. They existed in the midst of gigantic and ruthless forces. The forests were

[1] *Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 452.

[2] See also Isa. liv, 16; Amos iii, 6; Lam. iii, 38.

swept by storms of relentless fury, beasts of immense size and ferocity roamed in countless numbers through the trackless wilds, and food was secured only by great effort. For protection from the storms the caves were their first dwelling-place. The very fact that they lived in caves proves that they felt the pain and misery of exposure. Their muscular strength was no match for their brute enemies. Means of warfare had to be invented. The rude weapons of those early men may still be found in the river drift, the remains of a race that existed many thousands of years before the beginning of history. Deep buried in the calcareous floors of great caverns have been discovered the instruments of warfare which those wild tribes employed in the terrific struggle that consumed so much of their life. "They had bows and arrows, daggers of reindeer horn, spears tipped with flint or bone, and harpoons. Besides they made a formidable club of the lower jawbone of the cave bear, with its canine tooth still left in its place." Rather a formidable array of weapons for a people who knew nothing of pain. Sometimes, in war with other tribes, they fell into the hands of their enemies and became a toothsome morsel for cannibals. Sometimes they fell prey to the hyena, the mark of whose savage teeth is still left on their bones. Whoever invented the formula, "There is no

truth in pain," it certainly was not one of these primeval men.

As man's nature grew more complex methods had to be devised to satisfy his increasing wants. In his primitive state his clothing consisted of skins, his house was a rock shelter, his weapons were flint, and food was the great end of his life. But his intellect was quickened by the very struggle for existence. He came to prize whatever reinforced his powers, and the acquisition of this reinforcement was a matter of great importance. This was shown especially in the growth of social relations and the founding of civil order. Here appeared especially the advantage of knowledge. Ignorance came to be recognized as a hindrance, hedging the way of man in the attainment of "complete perfection or happiness of being," and so far ignorance was an evil, and always has been an evil.

Mrs. Eddy says that "life, God, omnipotent Good" denies evil; and that evil denies "life, God, omnipotent Good." That is, if there is evil, there is no God; and if God is, there is no evil. The denial of evil in the light of the facts we have just considered is absurd. Is there, therefore, no God? Is not this formula a vapid assertion, empty of both sense and logic? She has a *penchant* for conveying conclusions not contained in the premises. Thus she says, "If pain is as

real as the absence of pain, both must be immortal." She leaves the reader to draw the conclusion that pain cannot be immortal, therefore pain is not real. But who can prove that pain is not immortal? The refinement of our nature makes pain more delicate, not less real. Again, she says, "There is no pain in truth and no truth in pain." With the first term of this inversion she is not concerned; her purpose is to assert that there is no reality in pain. If she means by real something "actually existing, not fictitious, imaginary," then her statement is erroneous, as we have seen. But she boldly denies the possibility of sentiency. "Nerves do not feel." Let Mrs. Eddy remember that we do not know dead matter. All that we know of feeling is in connection with the nerves. If you put your finger in the fire, she says, you should not feel pain. "Holy inspiration has created states of mind which are able to nullify the action of the flames" (p. 54). Nerves, in her scheme, seem to have no power to convey sensations. How is it, then, that we associate sweetness with sugar? Is sugar on the tongue as neutral as chalk? Why is it that we pass our hand over a surface and say whether it is smooth or rough? If nerves are sensationless, let Mrs. Eddy explain how we have arrived at the attributes of objects around us. We do not live in a neutral, colorless world. It is full of variety

and beauty of form and color and quality, and the nerves of the body are the points of the mind's contact with the external world. To deny this is to deny the reality of all human knowledge; to admit it is to concede that we are sentient beings, and hence that we can feel pain.

"There is no pain in truth." As a matter of fact the most exquisite pain is in truth. A consciousness of sin is real and painful. The exigencies of Mrs. Eddy's scheme lead her practically to deny the reality of moral evil. She reminds us of Spinoza, who also denied evil, as he held that all was necessitated, and therefore nothing could exist which ought not to exist. Hence he also denied free will, a denial implicit in the teachings of Mrs. Eddy. It is a doctrine of which she makes no use; indeed, after denying personality there is no room left for it. If I am a person, constructing my own character, determining my own end in life, then I have free will. If I have no free will, I am not a person. But the consciousness of free will and responsibility in man is profound. We have the power of choice, which we constantly exercise. When a man chooses he also rejects. When good is his choice he rejects the opposite of good, which is evil. In the exercise of such a choice there attends the sense of moral responsibility. If there were nothing but good to be chosen, there could

be no such sense of responsibility. If evil were only an unreality and delusion, the profound sense of responsibility in choice would vanish. But this sense of responsibility is indestructible and universal, and as such witnesses to the reality of moral evil.

Mrs. Eddy says evil denies God—that is, evil is so incompatible with the nature of God that to admit the fact of evil is to deny the reality of God—and let it be remembered that this is physical, not moral, evil of which she speaks. Disease and pain are the chief forms of evil known to her book.

May not the contrary of her proposition be true? Physical evil is a fact, as we have seen, and God is a reality in some sense compatible with that fact. The solution of the problem may be beyond the power of the human mind, just as all facts of life retreat out of the finite into the infinite; but they begin in the finite, and so far what is known of them is real knowledge. If we assume that we are a part of a cosmical system of organic adaptations, in which "everthing is fitted into everything else," the assumption is supported by both observation and experience. Means and ends are recognized everywhere in nature. Science is full of the language of teleology, or purpose with reference to a definite end, and the adaptations in nature seem to culminate

in man. The whole system is adapted to man, and man is adapted to the whole. We have, therefore, an unwavering faith in the power that underlies the system and adaptations of nature. It is a power that makes for righteousness; it is purposive of perfection. Take away this faith, and pessimism alone remains. It is a faith undiminished by evil; that endures through the darkest night of human experience, because it knows that the ways of God are inscrutable. "Clouds and darkness are round about him, but righteousness and judgment are the establishment of his throne."

There must, therefore, be an end that pain is intended to serve, and moralists are doubtless right in regarding pain as well as pleasure as an incentive to right action—that is, pleasure is an incentive to the pursuit of the right, and pain of aversion to wrong. Thus the latter plays an important part in the attainment of man's ideal. Hence we see how important the consciousness of pain. Any system that would deprive man of this consciousness would so far thwart his moral development.

It is an error to treat pain as a delusion. We must recognize its profound uses in the economy of life. Has it not offered the "highest possibilities and most fruitful occasions of character?" Has not fortitude, a most sturdy virtue, grown

under its discipline? And has not pain often afforded the strongest evidence of love, as when a strong man perils his life for his family, or a patriot is shot to pieces in defense of liberty? The chief end of life is not to escape from pain, for in so doing we may miss the highest good. To make it contribute to manhood is to subdue pain. To the reflection from the neighboring snow fields Davos and St. Moritz owe largely their high winter temperature, and thus often the most forbidding things in life bring us the opposite of what they threaten. So it is with pain. It lays ruthless hands upon the structure of the body; it rends into tatters the veil of life, but this is the very process by which life acquires its fruitage; and "what matters it if the blossoms are swept away by the wind and rain, so the fruit is set?"[1]

Again, sympathy, so vital in the evolution of a worthy life, begins at pain. Even animals will rush to one of their kind moaning in distress, and it is this instinct that rises into Christian charity, into love that cherishes, and sacrifices

[1] Christian Science rules Paul out when he makes such statements as the following: "Ye know that it was by reason of physical infirmity that I preached the gospel unto you on the first of my two visits; and the facts of my bodily constitution which were trying to you were not despised nor rejected by you, but ye received me as a messenger of God." Gal. iv, 13, 14 (see Greek text). See also 2 Cor. i, 8.

for those that suffer. It was the pains of the world that took hold of Christ. When he healed the lad at the Mount of Transfiguration he did not stand aloof from him, but he took him by the hand, he came very near and entered into sympathy with him. Thus he grasps every hand of distress and pain, and presents the great example of sacrifice. To all men, as to him, "pain is the possibility of all that lies in sacrifice, because it is the possibility of disinterested sympathy, and so of all self-sacrifice." Hence sympathy is the bond of all vital union among men; as the best natures always have the most of it, so, as Coleridge says, "By sympathy all powerful souls have kindred with each other." What should we miss more in life than sympathy? We can spare the labors of men; we may lose position, influence, wealth, and even health, and yet live on in comfort if with resignation; but life would not be worth living without human sympathy. Thus pain, without which there could be no sympathy, is a minister of God.

Neither pain nor death deny God; both affirm him. Death, which nature uses in the service of life, is a mighty angel of God. Without it the earth would soon be overpeopled and life deprived of its latitude. It keeps open the field for life; it moves one generation off while another enters on the theater of time. It avoids

the disadvantages of universal senility, for not even Christian Science can prevent us growing old. It clears the way for every discovery of truth, makes progress possible, and makes impossible the immortality of bigotry. It brings a sudden end to despotism and tyranny, and to the promoters of moral evil, while it gives a fresh chance to the growth of virtue and goodness with every generation. The fear of death must depart from the Christ-conquered heart, because it has no realm of its own, no sinister purposes, no message but love. It is true "that life is ever lord of death," and hence it is a vile calumny that charges death with denying God.

Amiel says: "To curse grief is easier than to bless it, but to do so is to fall back into the point of view of the earthly, the carnal, the natural man. By what has Christianity subdued the world if not by the apotheosis of grief, by its marvelous transmutation of suffering into triumph, of the crown of thorns into the crown of glory, and of a gibbet into a symbol of salvation? What does the apotheosis of the cross mean if not the death of death, the defeat of sin, the beatification of martyrdom, the raising to the skies of voluntary sacrifice, the defiance of pain? 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?' By long brooding over this theme—the agony of the just, peace in the midst

of agony, and the heavenly beauty of such peace —humanity came to understand that a new religion was born, a new mode, that is to say, of explaining life and of understanding suffering.

"Suffering was a curse from which man fled; now it becomes a purification of the soul, a sacred trial sent by eternal Love, a divine dispensation meant to sanctify and ennoble us, an acceptable aid to faith, a strange initiation into happiness. O power of belief! All remains the same, and yet all is changed. A new certitude arises to deny the apparent and the tangible; it pierces through the mystery of things; it places an invisible Father behind visible nature; it shows us joy shining through tears, and makes of pain the beginning of joy."

## VII. Proof Texts.

It is not surprising that Mrs. Eddy attempts to put the seal of divine approval upon her philosophy by quotations from the Scriptures. In her enthusiasm for a new "discovery" she does what hundreds of others have done in like circumstances—she reads it all into the Bible. Her method of interpretation bears some resemblance to that of Origen and Swedenborg. She does not interpret Scripture regardless of any principles, but those that she adopts are unsound. Before we consider her exegesis let us attend to what constitutes sound principles of Biblical Interpretation.

Principles of Biblical Interpretation upon which all can agree are very desirable. There can be no unity of Christian thought if each one is allowed to interpret according to his fancy. Nor is there any reason why the Bible is an exception to all other literature in this respect. Interpretation of literature in general gives us the principles and laws of Biblical Interpretation. This is a maxim which has been regarded as incontrovertible by all the great authorities since Ernesti. From whence did these principles spring? Are they artificial productions imposed on Scripture by extensive learning? Have they grown out of a love for subtleties and nice distinctions? Are

they sparks of genius? Far from being this, they are not the invention of man, scarcely a discovery of his. "They are coeval with our nature. Ever since man was created and endowed with the powers of speech and made a communicative, social being he has had occasion to practice upon the principles of interpretation, and has done so."[1] To understand human speech one must be an interpreter, and upon the exercise of the commonly accepted principles of interpretation all social and business intercourse depends. Without these principles we would cease to be rational beings in an orderly world. If men interpreted the language of business as arbitrarily as they often interpret the Bible, there could be no financial stability.

Hence in Biblical Interpretation we must consider the meaning of words, the construction of sentences, the environment of the writer, the unexpressed relations of thought in the mind of the writer, and parallel passages. But we must further constantly bear in mind that the Bible is a product of double authorship—the divine and human. The unique fact of the divine authorship, however, does not change the principle that the words must be interpreted as used in human speech.

Hence there is no justification for what is

[1] Professor Moses Stuart.

known as the double sense of Scripture. Typical meaning in a passage does not give it double sense, nor is such an interpretation to be derived from predictive phophecy. The Scripture never claims a double sense for itself; and if we may impose a double sense, why not a threefold or a fourfold sense?

Some of the early interpreters, indeed, said that, as there were four rivers in paradise, there should be four streams of truth or teaching flowing out of the Bible. With a double sense the book would become merely a collection of riddles. When men want to make riddles they give a double sense to language; but the Bible is not a collection of conundrums; it is a book that the uneducated may read intelligently, so that we may find in the Christian world a common sense of Scripture.

What is called "exegesis" in Mrs. Eddy's book is at best only an attempt to fortify her system by the quotation of sundry texts utterly foreign to the thought. Each of these texts she follows with a reiteration of her ideas, which is made to have the appearance of interpretation.

Thus, take the first verse of Genesis: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." In the light of all rules of Biblical Interpretation this is a plain statement that God created the known world. Mrs. Eddy cannot resist the

temptation to make a riddle of it. The passage, she says, affirms the eternal verity and unity of God and man, including the universe. God means the creative principle—life, truth, and love. The universe is God's reflection. "The creation consists of the unfolding of spiritual ideas and their identities, which are embraced in the infinite mind and forever reflected."

Mrs. Eddy says that the word Elohim (translated God in this passage) means "life, truth, love." Here again she is in error. It means the "Being who is feared." "Love casteth out fear," hence Elohim did not denote love to the Hebrew mind. Further, how does the passage affirm the "unity of God and man, including the universe?" and where does it contain any warrant for the pantheistic method of creation which she reads into it? It is the old fallacy of the double sense—Bible riddle-making.

As we proceed more and more we are involved in the spiritualizing of plain Scripture. Thus, Gen. i, 6, "And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters." What does "water" mean? What does "firmament" mean? Let our expositor inform us: Firmament has a spiritual significance and means "understanding." She leaves us to infer that truth is the water above the firmament, and error is the water

under it (p. 499). "God called the firmament heaven," says the writer of Genesis. Mrs. Eddy says that these words mean that "spirit unites understanding to eternal harmony through divine science." Why not? It certainly is as easy to say this as to say a great many other things in her book.

But Mrs. Eddy waxes bold as she proceeds with her exegesis of Genesis. When she comes to the seventh verse of the second chapter she confronts a passage that requires even a fourfold sense to take the "matter" out of it. "And the Lord God (Jehovah) formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." The phrase "dust of the ground" has an ominous sound to the Christian Scientist. "How can a material organization become the basis of man? How can the nonintelligent become the medium of mind?" she exclaims, impatiently. "Is it the truth? or is it a lie concerning man and God? It must be the latter," she concludes (p. 517).

Gen. iii, 16 is handled very cautiously. "Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." This, says our exegete, unveils the results of sin, as shown in sickness and death. But let the reader

observe that the immediate cause of these results was God. "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow." God is thus represented as the cause of sorrow, pain, evil. How, then, does evil deny God? The fourth proposition on page 7 of *Science and Health* cannot be defended in the light of this text.[1]

We are anticipating presently to be introduced to the origin of mortal mind, and we are brought to it in the comment on Gen. iii, 22–24. Here it is conceded that it had a definite beginning. The first chapter of Genesis, she says, represents creation "as spiritual, entire, and good." Here "evil has no local habitation or name;" but the second chapter "is to depict the falsity of error and its effects." But how did this mortal mind arise? If God is good, and God is all, if man when he came from the hands of his Creator was a pure reflection of God, if "will-power is but an illusion of belief" and "not a faculty of soul" (p. 486); if, therefore, man has no power in himself to determine his own life, whence came mortal mind? What relation does God, who is all, and man, who is a reflection of God, sustain to mortal mind, which is "error creating other errors?" This question must be answered to save the air castle of mortal mind.

It is unnecessary to follow further the spiritualizing method of Mrs. Eddy's exegesis. Often

[1] See page 47.

she brings passages together in such a relation as to create a false impression. Thus she says that Christ's imperative command to his disciples was to "preach the gospel to every creature," "*heal the sick*" (p. 343). Now, healing the sick was not included in the great commission and was not thus passed on as an authoritative command to his Church. She says the first Christian duty Jesus taught his followers was "the healing power of truth and love" (p. 336). If by this she means that truth and love are healing to a sin-sick soul, the statement is not new to Christians. If she means that the healing of physical disease was the supreme Christian duty that Jesus imposed on his followers, it is not true. The error at this point is vital. The mission of Jesus to the world was not primarily the healing of disease. His work was spiritual. He came to touch the springs of man's deepest life; to break the chains of spiritual slavery; to put hope in the heart of the poor and desponding; to open to the blind a new and true view of life; to usher in the acceptable year of the Lord, the kingdom of God in the human heart. Physical refreshing is an *incident* of this spiritual renewing. He came to bring life to the soul of man. He addressed the reason, the imagination, the will. He sought to restore normal relations between man and God, and thus to harmonize the world. He instituted

a spiritual movement that has progressively contributed to human well-being in its entire range. He was to the individual and thence to society a divine uplifting power; he was the concrete expression of divine truth toward man; he was the ideal of life, and be became incarnate in humanity, that in him humanity might become divine, and that divinity might become human.[1] But his mission was not to work miracles. He sought to hush the report of his miracles; he would be known as a teacher come from God, a planter of truth in the mind; a king who had come to establish his kingdom—the realm of truth, the kingdom of God in which the will of God should be done in the whole of human life.

Too large a place is given to miracles in all that class of teaching to which Christian Science belongs. The whole course of nature is miraculous if the word means the manifestation of divine power; and we are most intimately joined to the course of nature. Nature is not thus confined to things that are material, but includes all established order, whether it be in the region of sense or of spirit. It is not improbable that in view of man's free agency, which has been used in the interest of evil—the assertion of his personality above scientific order—God may deviate from

[1] John iii, 17; xii, 47; xviii, 37; xvii, 21, 23.

the course of nature in the interest of grace, but as we cannot think of God acting without law, miracles must still be natural—that is, dispensed by the higher law of perfect reason acting with regard to the most beneficent purpose. Hence it is nature that should be emphasized, and it is nature we need, and less the supernatural, in order to correctly conceive the Gospel and the kingdom of God. In fact, it is the regular and not the irregular course of nature that Christianity encourages. Thus it may ultimately be discovered that many of the miracles of Jesus were wrought under some psychic law unknown to his time, some law, it is true, discoverable to human genius; but this does not prove that he exercised only "the natural endowments of a remarkable man who was before his time in the healing art." On the other hand, it would show that the methods of nature are divinely approved, just as they are approved in our moral education in the experience of our common life. Science shows many things belonging to the established order of nature today that yesterday were regarded as miraculous. That Jesus conformed to nature does not deprive him of the glory of his works. Is nature less the manifestation of the immanent God because it is orderly? Hence we cannot believe that God will stop the wheels of nature, violate its laws, and make some startling display of power just to

please the freak of some dyspeptic or to answer the prayers of some erratic mind.

The glory of the Son of God was manifested in his mighty works—that is, he thus showed himself intimately allied with God, and thus worthy of attention as the divine teacher.[1] The recognition of these works as natural in no way detracts from his mission to reveal the Father. "We can, therefore, afford to regard the attempt," says Professor Bruce, "to reduce the miracles of healing to the level of the natural with considerable equanimity. If that view were established, these 'miracles' would lose their value as signs annexed to a doctrinal revelation—the function on which the older apologists laid so much stress—but they would retain and even in some respects increase their value as a very important integral part of revelation—as a revelation of the infinite depths of compassion in the heart of the Son of man."[2]

It should be remembered that the gospels contain the record of only about thirty so-called miracles, according to the usual interpretation, and this number may no doubt be largely reduced. In current Jewish thought at the time of Christ the symbolism of death was applied to those who were "dead in sin." In the Targum

[1] John ii, 11; xi, 4; ix, 3.

[2] *Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, p. 54.

blindness was applied to deficiency of spiritual vision, lameness to spiritual inactivity. It was said: "In the coming age the saints shall raise the dead as Elias did. . . . What 'dead?' 'Proselytes.'" The language of Jesus continues this Jewish usage: "Let the dead bury their dead;" "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God." Hence we naturally infer that when he said to the twelve, "Raise the dead," he meant "make proselytes." The process of translating the Gospel from Eastern metaphor and poetry into Greek prose might easily give rise to hypothesis of miracles where no miracle was intended. That we find in parallel passages one gospel saying that Jesus "healed," while another says that he "taught," suggests that the healing is a misunderstanding of a word intended to mean "spiritual healing" or "teaching." Thus in Matt. xiv, 14, we read, "And he came forth, and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, and healed their sick." The same incident is thus referred to in Mark vi, 34: "And he came forth and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things" (compare also Mark x, i, with Matt. xix, 2). In the parable of the sower, in quoting Isa. vi, 9, 10, Matthew has, "Lest I should heal them;" Mark, "Lest their sins should be for-

given." In the charge to the disciples, which Mrs. Eddy, without warrant, joins with the great commission, Jesus says, "Heal the sick; freely ye have received, freely give." As they had freely received spiritual life, so they were to impart it. Evidently it was not literal disease that they were sent to cure. Thus we may infer that when great multitudes are spoken of as healed at a time it was spiritual cure that was effected.[1]

The spiritual work of Jesus Christ, therefore, demands primary attention. The healing miracles were numerous enough to confirm his claims to divinity, but not sufficiently numerous to overshadow his spiritual purpose. They show the comprehensiveness of Christ's conception of salvation. He was thus the pioneer of Christian philanthropy and of every movement that aimed at social amelioration. They show that the scope of the kingdom of God covers all that relates to the well-being of man, that temporal interests are to be considered as well as eternal interests, that social salvation is a part of the redemptive plan. But while they teach us that Christ was not an ultra spiritualist, there is no evidence that he came to establish a dispensation of "miraculous" healing of disease. That the apostles practiced the healing of the sick in his name would be a convincing apology for the Gospel in a time of stress

[1] Edwin Abbott, in *The New World*, September, 1896.

and an emergent substitute for medical methods which were then unknown. The apostle, however, gives us a great law that applies in physical as well as spiritual sickness: "Work out your own salvation, for it is he that worketh in you." God works in us, but he does not override our personality. "We are workers together with God." By the exercise of our own minds we must find the means of cure through which God works in the overthrow of disease. The way of life is divinely ordained. We must come back to nature and by nature's laws ascend to spiritual manhood and physical health.

# IV
# The Cures

# IV

## The Cures

HOW far back the belief in demoniacal possession extends it is difficult to say, but the devil has long come in for a very large share of the blame for our human sicknesses. A few years ago a natural cause of disease was as little understood as a natural method of cure. Hence the priestly class was early and long and intimately connected with the healing art, and for centuries the practice of medicine was regarded as unfriendly to religion. Even the canon law of the Roman Church long declared the precepts of medicine contrary to divine knowledge. Relics came to be regarded as possessed of marvelous curative powers, and were so extensively used that "enormous revenues flowed into various monasteries and churches in all parts of Europe." From this source a great demand arose for amulets and charms, which was a reversion to heathen fetichism. In 1471 Pope Paul II expatiated to the Church on the efficacy of a fetich, which consisted of a piece of wax from the paschal candles, stamped with the figure of a lamb and consecrated to the pope. This was recommended to preserve men from fire, shipwreck, tempest, lightning, hail, as well as in assist-

ing women in childbirth. Relics and fetiches now became very common, and the scientific study of medicine was discouraged.

The warfare offered by the Church authorities to the study of medicine was relentless and bitter. Supernatural means of cure were so abundant it seemed irreligious to employ natural means. Hence St. Bernard declared that monks who took medicine were guilty of conduct unbecoming religion. "Even the school of Salerno was held in aversion by multitudes of strict churchmen, since it prescribed rules for diet, thereby indicating a belief that diseases arise from natural causes and not from the malice of the devil."

The pursuit of anatomical studies, so necessary to a scientific system of medicine, was long and bitterly opposed. It was unlawful to meddle with the bodies of the dead, an inheritance of pagan civilizations, as, for example, in Egypt the embalmer was regarded as accursed. Again, it was insisted that mutilating the body might injure its final resurrection; and finally it was announced that the Church of Rome, which has caused a greater spilling of innocent blood than any other organization, "abhors the shedding of blood." Thus the battle raged between science and superstition. When at last medicines were tolerated those only were allowed that bore the divine sign or signature, as it was called. Hence

it was held that "bloodroot, on account of its red juice, was good for the blood; liverwort, having a leaf like the liver, cures diseases of the liver; eyebright, being marked with a spot like an eye, cures diseases of the eye; celandine, having a yellow juice, cures jaundice; bugloss, resembling a snake's head, cures snake bite; red flannel, looking like blood, cures blood taints, and therefore rheumatism; bear's grease, being taken from an animal thickly covered with hair, is recommended to persons fearing baldness." In surgery the Church also had its remedies: "The application of various ordures relieved fractures; the touch of the hangman cured sprains; the breath of a donkey expelled poison; friction with a dead man's tooth cured toothache."[1]

The cure of diseases by relics, charms, and superstitious remedies was as remarkable as any cures effected by Christian Science. The relics of St. Rosalia had for ages cured diseases and warded off epidemics, and Professor Buckland's discovery that they were the bones of a goat in no way interfered with their magical powers. Long was the sacred spring connected with the Cathedral of Trondhjem, famed for its healing efficacy, while angel voices, issuing from the adjacent walls, cheered the sufferer to believe himself cured. The restoration of this cathedral has

[1] *Warfare of Science with Theology*, vol. ii, pp. 39, 40.

uncovered the speaking tubes used by these voices, which are now known to have been far from angelic, but the cures were no less real. As early as the eleventh century what was known as the royal touch began to be practiced in England under Edward the Confessor. This was supposed to be peculiarly efficacious for epilepsy and scrofula, the latter being consequently known as the king's evil. There is overwhelming testimony to the reality of these cures, the best authorities being witnesses. Charles II touched nearly one hundred thousand persons, and the outlay for gold medals, issued to the afflicted on these occasions, rose in some years as high as ten thousand pounds. "John Brown, surgeon in ordinary to his majesty and to St. Thomas's Hospital, and author of many learned works on surgery and anatomy, published accounts of sixty cures due to the touch of this monarch." [1]

Christian Science enjoys no solitary distinction as a divine curative agency. The Roman Catholic Church can point to innumerable cures effected during the ages by relics and shrines. Lourdes is in full operation to-day, with a host of witnesses to its healing power. Stacks of crutches are left annually at the shrine of St. Anne de Beaupre, in Canada. Relics are scattered all over the world, with witnesses everywhere who have been healed.

[1] *Warfare of Science*, vol. ii, p. 46.

"Divine Healing," a system of Protestant faith cure, has also its marvels to tell—men and women cured of rheumatism, dyspepsia, spinal diseases, typhoid fever, and numerous other maladies. A church of this faith in Chicago issues weekly a paper, called *Leaves of Healing*, filled with testimonies confirming the claims of the leaders of the movement that it is the only divinely approved way to recover lost health. Spiritism also comes in for its share of healing marvels. A tumbler of water is changed by spirit agency into a tonic, an emetic, a cathartic, or an anodyne, as the case requires. Again, the witnesses and converts are numerous. Independent administrators of supernatural curative power travel about the country followed by long trains of enthusiastic believers, the credentials of their ministry. Thousands in Denver, relieved from the thraldom of disease, lifted their voices in praise of Francis Schlatter. He simply touched the afflicted, or in some instances only a handkerchief brought to him from the bedside of the sick, and at once the poor sufferer began to feel the thrill of returning health. The craze for this barbarous treatment of disease is satisfied with anything so that scientific medicine is kept out of the case. A woman brings six reliable witnesses into court to prove that a compound of red earth and bull pups is a specific for "terri-

ble ailments." A Negro woman in New York works wonders with "grease taken from the tail of a black cat that had died with its throat cut." The more ignorant the worker, and the more unreasonable the methods, the more satisfactory the results. Anything to get away from the use of our God-given intelligence. It is assumed that the exercise of the human mind in the course of man's experience on earth has in no way increased its knowledge or its capacity. If a primitive man with his thick skull and coat of hair could be raised from the dead, he would be the best doctor of all. In lieu of him we have the faith doctor in his chameleon forms.

Mrs. Eddy claims that the difference between her system and all others is the difference between faith and understanding. Faith may make a very good beginning in the healing art, she says, but it should lead on to understanding, which is Christian Science.[1] If by understanding Mrs. Eddy means her philosophy, we have seen that it is error. If she means that Christian Science does not depend on faith in the treatment of disease, her statement is misleading. The first and last thing she requires of the sick is faith. There must first be perfect quiescence. Every opposition of the mind must be hushed into silence. She affirms that matter has no real exist-

[1] *Science and Health*, p. 193.

ence, that even the body is only a false belief of mortal mind, and therefore no disease of the body is possible. This principle of the system is carefully expounded to the patient. He is expected to acquiesce—that is, to have faith—though it be against every deliverance of sense and reason. If he protests, he is soothed into a passive state, and urged to hold his mind in the attitude of denying the possible existence of disease. For half an hour the patient and the healer remain silent and passive; the patient's faith meanwhile has grown stronger, and at the end of the *séance* he is ready to affirm that he feels better. When the patient comes to the healer with the affirmation of his skepticism in the system he is informed that Christian Science requires no faith; no difference what he believes, he can be cured. Brightening with hope, he submits to the treatment, "full of the faith that he is to be healed without faith."[1]

All systems of mental healing seem to come under a common law, which may probably be derived from the study of hypnotism. There is resident in the mind a marvelous power over the functions and sensations of the body. Since the time of St. Francis of Assisi numerous instances of stigmatization are recorded in the lives of the saints. Dr. Carpenter, in his *Mental Physiol-*

[1] Hudson, *Law of Psychic Phenomena*, p. 160.

*ogy*, p. 689, gives a well-authenticated instance: "The case of Louise Lateau has undergone a scrutiny so careful on the part of medical men determined to find out the deceit, if such could exist, that there seems no adequate reason for doubting its genuineness. This young Belgian peasant had been the subject of an exhausting illness, from which she recovered rapidly after receiving the sacrament; a circumstance which obviously made a strong impression on her mind. Soon afterward blood began to issue every Friday from a spot in her left side; in the course of a few months similar bleeding spots established themselves on the front and back of each hand and on the upper surface of each foot, while a circle of small spots formed on the forehead; and the hemorrhage from these recurred every Friday, sometimes to a considerable amount. About the same time fits of 'ecstasy' began to recur, commencing every Friday, between eight and nine A. M., and ending about six P. M., interrupting her in conversation, in prayer, or in manual occupation." When she recovered she remembered distinctly what had passed through her mind during the "ecstasy." She had witnessed the passion, and "minutely described the cross and the vestments, the wounds, and the crown of thorns about the head of the Saviour."

What the power of the mind is that produces

this remarkable phenomenon we do not know, but it is claimed for hypnotism that it can be evoked under proper suggestion. Thus M. Bourru put a patient into the somnambulistic condition and gave him the following suggestion: "At four o'clock this afternoon, after the hypnosis, you will come into my office, sit down in the arm-chair, cross your arms upon your breast, and your nose will begin to bleed. At the hour appointed the young man did as directed. Several drops of blood came from the left nostril."

"On another occasion the same investigator traced the patient's name on both his forearms with the dull point of an instrument. Then when the patient was in the somnambulistic condition he said: 'At four o'clock this afternoon you will go to sleep, and your name will appear written on your arms in letters of blood.' He was watched at four o'clock, and seen to fall asleep. On the left arm the letters stood out in bright-red relief, and in several places there were drops of blood."

"Dr. Mabille, director of the insane asylum at Laford, near Rochelle, a former pupil of Bernheim, of excellent standing, repeated the experiment made upon this subject after he was removed to the asylum, and confirmed it. He obtained instant hemorrhage over a determined region of the body. He also induced an attack

of spontaneous somnambulism, in which the patient, doubting his personality, so to speak, suggested to himself the hemorrhagic stigmata on the arm, thus repeating the marvelous phenomena of the famous stigmatized autosuggestionist, Louise Lateau."[1]

These cases show the susceptibility of the mind to suggestion, and the control it exercises, when in a hypnotic state, over the organic functions; a conclusion arrived at by Bernheim and other students of the subject. This profound mental power is now being turned by physicians to therapeutic purposes. Neurasthenia, neuralgia, rheumatism, insomnia, traumatic spine, morphia-mania, and other drug habits readily yield to this treatment. Dr. Cocke mentions a case of spinal irritation caused by a railroad accident. He says: "The patient was hypnotized in ten minutes. Suggestions were made to him while in that condition that his spine would no longer be sore. He was told that he could walk well. At the same time I told him that I would give him a piece of metal that was magnetized, and that every time he felt the symptoms of disease during the day he would receive a strong electric shock from the metal.

"I took an aluminium pocket-piece from my pocket which was sent to me as an advertise-

[1] Bernheim, *Suggestive Therapeutics*, pp. 36, 37.

ment from some firm, and punching some holes through it with my knife, bound it on the side of his shirt next his skin. I suggested that, when he was awaking from the hypnotic state, he would go immediately down stairs and get me a glass of water, and would not use his crutches. He had not taken a step without them for five years. I then commanded him to wake up. He did so, began to move around restlessly, complained of the heat, and said, 'Would you like a glass of water?' Receiving an affirmative answer, he rose and went down stairs without the crutches, to the amazement of his family, walking perfectly well. He brought the water up, complained of headache and drowsiness, and I again hypnotized him, and told him that these symptoms would pass off, and that he would feel jolly. Again he was awakened and his whole manner changed. He was lively and walked around the room with ease. He slept five hours that night, and in two weeks resumed his business, and has been perfectly well ever since."

Professor Bernheim, in his work on *Suggestive Therapeutics*, says: "Since 1882 I have experimented with the suggestive method which I have seen used by M. Liebault, though timidly at first, and without any confidence. To-day it is daily used in my clinic; I practice it before my

students; perhaps no day passes in which I do not show them some functional trouble, pain, paresis, uneasiness, insomnia, either moderated or instantly suppressed by suggestion.

"Here is a man twenty-six years old, a workman in the foundries. For a year he has experienced a painful feeling of constriction over the epigastrium, also a pain in the corresponding region in the back, which was the result of an effort made in bending an iron bar. The sensation is continuous, and increases when he has worked for some hours. For six months he has been able to sleep only by pressing his epigastrium with his hand. I hypnotize him. In the first *séance* I can induce only simple drowsiness; he wakes spontaneously; the pain continues. I hypnotize him a second time, telling him that he will sleep more deeply, and that he will remember nothing when he wakes. Catalepsy is not present; I wake him in a few minutes; he does not remember that I spoke to him, that I assured him that the pain had disappeared. It had completely disappeared; he no longer feels any constriction. I do not know whether it has reappeared."[1]

It must be remembered that the hypnotic state may exist in different degrees. It is not in all cases necessary that sleep should be induced. A

[1] Bernheim, *Suggestive Therapeutics*, p. 206.

person may be susceptible to hypnotic suggestion who is conscious of no change from his normal condition. The attention needs only to be so held that the impression may be made deeply upon the mind. It is very well known that simple suggestion under favorable conditions may act beneficially on the health. A cheerful home, pleasant and hopeful companions, useful occupation, may do much in some cases to effect a cure. Association with a strong and healthy mind is a tonic to the weak. Says Dr. Cocke: "The psychic impression which one person makes upon another is, at the same time, the most subtle and the most powerful sociological factor that exists. Is it not reasonable, then, that association with those who are congenial to us should prove a stimulus which tends to restore health?" If, then, the attention is held, and a profound therapeutic suggestion is produced in the mind, the conditions of hypnotism are met.

Webster defines telepathy thus: "The sympathetic affection of one mind by the thoughts, feeling, or emotions of another at a distance, without communication through the ordinary channels of sensation." If, now, this power of the mind is real (and the facts of telepathy are as conclusive as the facts of Christian Science), then absent treatment by suggestion is possible. The mind of the healer may travel a hundred

miles to influence the mind of the sick with which it is *en rapport.* Mr. Hudson claims that he has treated many cases successfully in this way. Rheumatism, neuralgia, dyspepsia, sick headache, torpidity of the liver, bronchitis, partial paralysis, have yielded to absent treament.[1]

Christian Science can produce nothing more wonderful than the cures of hypnotism, and there is such a close resemblance between their methods that we have every reason to believe that they both come under the same law.

First, faith brings the two minds, that of the healer and that of the patient, *en rapport.* Whether or not the Christian Scientist will admit it, she cannot and will not dispense with faith. Herein the attention is secured; and, second, a therapeutic suggestion is made to the mind. The healer insists that disease is a false belief of mortal mind. The patient is to repeat in his mind the affirmation of health. Silence is required, while the attention is fixed on the proposition that *matter is nothing; the mind cannot be sick.* The hypnotic state ensues. The healer, oblivious of all else, seeks to impart the suggestion of health. Third, the first *séance* usually proves only partly successful, which will require another sitting, when the cure will be more pronounced. Even if entirely successful the first

[1] Hudson, *Law of Psychic Phenomena*, p. 195.

time, the suggestion will gradually fade from the mind, and the bad feelings will return. This the healer calls a relapse into mortal mind. Repeated *séances* give the suggestion a certain vitality, when it is asserted a cure has been effected.

Hypnotism follows the same steps with the same experience. Indeed, all systems of faith cure proceed silmilarly, and even the methods pursued by barbarians in primitive times often have a family likeness to these systems. Solomon O'Bail, a great medicine man among the Seneca Indians, depended little on herbs. While the patient sat on the earth before him his lips were pressed to a rude flute, the soft music of which was intended to exorcise the evil spirits that caused the sickness and invoke the aid of the great spirit. The notes were in the minor key and plaintive. The attention of the sufferer was fixed, his faith was awakened; both he and the healer believed that a cure was to be effected. The suggestion of health was imparted to the hypnotized mind; he recovered. Thus a Seneca Indian became renowned as a healer. He is one of a class of primitive men that were forerunners of all schools of mental healing, and should be regarded as representative of them.

But at the point of recovery by Christian Science a fact emerges that shows its identity

with hypnotism. It is well known that adverse suggestion brings a relapse in hypnotic treatment. The environment of the person must correspond with the original suggestion. If he tells of his cure in the presence of skeptical friends, their jeers and laughter will destroy the suggestion of health. Hypnotists cannot successfully carry out their experiments in the presence of a skeptical audience, especially when the skepticism is open and avowed. This is peculiarly marked in the higher phases of hypnotic phenomena. Now, the healer finds the same difficulty with her patients. They return again and again for treatment. They are warned not to argue, then not to read the newspapers, and to be careful of their associations, and finally they are advised that mingling with church people is fatal. There is something Jesuitical in this, for the poor invalid was first informed that he was not required to leave his Church in order to be a Christian Scientist, but he has come now to the inevitable end; he must separate from his Church and seek an environment that conspires with his faith and with the suggestion that has been made upon his mind by the healer.

Does the healer ever fail? It certainly is not to his interest to report the failures; the cures, however, are heralded far and wide. But these cures cannot be received without question. Was the patient really sick? Has he been restored to

health? Are inquiries not answered by mere assertion? On account of the idiosyncrasies of the mind the patient himself is not always a reliable witness. In a congregation of Christian Scientists there are many cases of well men cured of imaginary ills and of sick men who imagine themselves well. The failures are numerous. Many cases of death from diphtheria, pneumonia, consumption, and childbirth under Christian Science treatment are reliably reported. It is not our purpose to deny that cures have been effected, but the difficulty of verifying them must be conceded.

In his valuable book on *Faith Healing* Dr. J. M. Buckley submits a number of tests of the theory of Christian Science. We quote especially the following:

"*Second Test.* They deny that drugs, *per se*, as taken into the human system, have any power."

"Christian Science divests material drugs of their imaginary power. . . . The uselessness of drugs, the emptiness of knowledge, the nothingness of matter and its imaginary laws, are apparent as we rise from the rubbish of belief to the acquisition and demonstration of spiritual understanding. . . . When the sick recover by the use of drugs, it is the law of a general belief, culminating in individual faith that heals, and according to this faith will the effect be."—*Eddy.*

Surely the mind needs healing that could invent the following absurdity:

"The not uncommon notion that drugs possess absolute inherent curative virtues of their own involves an error. Arnica, quinine, opium, could not produce the effects ascribed to them except by imputed virtue. Men think they will act thus on the physical system, consequently they do. The property of alcohol is to intoxicate; but if the common thought had endowed it simply with a nourishing quality like milk, it would produce a similar effect. A curious question arises about the origin of healing virtues, if it be admitted that all drugs were originally destitute of them. We can conceive of a time in the mental history of the race when no therapeutic value was assigned to certain drugs, when in fact, it was not known that they possessed any. How did it come to pass that common thought, or any thought, endowed them with healing virtue, in the first place? Simply in this way: Man finding himself unprotected, and liable to be hurt by the elements in the midst of which he lived, forgot the true source of healing, and began to seek earnestly for material remedies of disease and wounds. The desire for something led to experiments; and with each trial there was associated the hope that the means applied would prove efficacious. Then what was at first an earnest

hope came at length to be a belief; and thus, by gradual steps, a belief in the contents of the entire pharmacopœia was established."—*Marston.*

It is true that in many cases the effect of a medicine is to be attributed entirely to the imagination, or to the belief that it will have such and such effects; but the statement of such extreme positions as these shows the irrationality of the theories upon which they are based. According to the above, if it were generally believed that alcohol were unintoxicating, nourishing, and bland as milk, it would be an excellent article with which to nourish infants; and, on the other hand, if it were generally believed that milk were intoxicating, all the influences of alcohol would be produced upon those who drank it. If the public could only be educated to believe alcohol to be nourishing, the entire mammalian genus might be nursing their offspring upon alcohol with equally good results. No insane asylum can furnish a more transparent delusion.

That drugs produce effects upon animals has been demonstrated beyond the possibility of contradiction, and that, when the animals did not know that they were taking drugs; and small doses have produced not the slightest effect, while large doses—the animals in each case not knowing that they were taking medicines—have produced great effect, and do so with uniformity.

Also the effect of medicines upon idiots and unconscious infants is capable of exact demonstration.

Allied to the effect of drugs is that of *poisons*, almost every drug having the effect of a poison if taken in excess. Some poisons, however, are of such nature that the smallest possible dose may be attended with fatal results. In the case of animals, poisons introduced into the system without the knowledge of the animals do their work effectually. Strychnine carefully introduced into a piece of meat so small that a cat will swallow it whole will in a very short time show its effects. The instinct of the animal will cause its rejection if there be the slightest possibility of perceiving it; but if sufficient means be taken to keep the animal from knowing that it is taking anything except meat, it will swallow the meat, and the poison will do its work.

These facts are admitted by the advocates of Christian Science and mind cure, and the lunacy of their theories is seen in the manner in which they attempt to account for the effects.

"If a dose of poison is swallowed through mistake, the patient dies, while physician and patient are expecting favorable results. Did belief cause this death? Even so, and as directly as if the poison had been intentionally taken. . . . The few who think a drug harmless, where a mistake

has been made in the prescription, are unequal to the many who have named it poison, and so the majority opinion governs the result."—*Eddy.*

"It is said that arsenic kills; but it would be very difficult for anyone to prove how it kills, since persons have had all the symptoms of arsenic poisoning without having taken any arsenic; and, again, persons have taken arsenic and did not die. . . . Suppose you take a child that knows nothing about arsenic and administer the usual dose; the child will probably die, but I will show you that the arsenic was not the cause of the death. . . . Here you may say, 'What had the life of the child to do with the action, the child not knowing anything about arsenic?' We will admit that the child was ignorant of the nature of poison, but all who are educated in theology and *materia medica* know that it kills; therefore the thought, although unconscious to the child, was hereditary in its life. It is, indeed, a universal thought admitted as a fact in every life or soul. A thought is a product of life, and is action, and this thought, produced and accepted by life, acts upon the life of the child and produces unconsciously a confusion therein. This confusion produces a fear; this fear in the child's life heats the blood and causes the first conscious action."—*Arens.*

"The effects of various experiments with chem-

icals and medicine upon cats and dogs are studied most minutely by distinguished scientific men, and the results witnessed published to the world, with a presumption of wisdom and profundity of learning that carry the conviction to most minds that the properties of such drugs and their effects upon the *human system* have been forever established. And *materia medica* falls back upon these so-called demonstrations of science as absolutely indisputable proofs of its theories. Now, it never seems to have occurred to them that all the effects witnessed of such experimenting might be accounted for on the basis of *thought*, and with the view of investigating the subject to establish a totally opposite explanation; and to show that mind acting on matter could account for all their facts the following experiments have been recently made: The object of the experiments was a dog, a noble thoroughbred, of great sagacity and intelligence. The first experiment consisted in conveying commands to him entirely through *mind*. Not a word was *spoken*, but his mistress would say to him mentally, 'Carlo, come here,' or 'Carlo, lie down,' and although the *thought* might have to be repeated mentally a number of times, yet it would reach him, and sometimes he would respond almost immediately. Second experiment: One day his master discovered an appearance to which he

gave the name *mange*. All the dogs around were having it. It was catching. Dr. So-and-so had pronounced it mange, and prescribed a mixture of sulphur and castor oil, etc., which was to be applied *externally* in such a way that Carlo, in attempting to remove the preparation with his tongue, would get a dose into his system. But here the mistress interposed, and insisted that Carlo should be subjected wholly to mental treatment. The result was entirely satisfactory. The appearance vanished as it came. Again the experiment of placing Carlo entirely under the intelligence of his master's mind and thoughts for a certain period was tried and compared with the effects of leaving him wholly under his mistress's mind. In the former case he soon exhibited every symptom of dyspepsia and indigestion in every form, to which the master was subject, and in a very marked degree. But under the thought of the mistress every symptom and appearance vanished at once. He soon attained a perfection of physical condition, which constantly attracted the notice of everyone. Experiments of this kind were carried much further, and can be by anyone who wishes to test the matter for themselves. In all the instances just mentioned the physical condition of the dog responded to the mind under whose influence it chanced to be. Love and fear (*especially fear*) are the most marked characteris-

tics of the animal mind. The instances are innumerable where the instinct of the animal surpasses the reason of man in detecting the kindly thought or the thought of *harm* toward itself. When a scientific experimenter gives a drug to a dog it is done with a perfect certainty in his mind that disorder, derangement of the system, suffering, etc., in some form or another, are sure to follow. A *fear* corresponding to the thought of man instantly seizes upon the dog, and various results *do* follow. The experimenter notes them down and then proceeds to try his drug on dog number two, all the while holding in his mind an image of the results of experiment number one, expecting to see similar results. In all probability he sees them."—*Stuart.*[1]

*Third Test.* Extraordinary accidents to the body. Whatever may be said of the power of thought in the production of ordinary disease,

[1] Mrs. Stuart in the foregoing passage is only a little more absurd than Mrs. Eddy. "The preference of 'mortal mind' for any method creates a demand for it, and the body seems to require it. You can even educate a healthy horse so far in physiology that he will take cold without his blanket; whereas the wild animal, left to his instincts, sniffs the wind with delight." The connection of this quotation with what goes before shows that the horse does not take cold, in the opinion of Mrs. Eddy, because, having been accustomed to the blanket, his system is so weakened that he will take cold without it, but because the training of the said horse has been such that he is led to believe that if the blanket is not on, he will take cold!

the effects of accidents to persons who are entirely unconscious when they occur, as the sleeping victims of railroad disasters, are facts which, if they do not terminate human life at once, require the aid of surgery.

Mrs. Eddy says:

"The fear of dissevered bodily members, or a belief in such a possibility, is reflected on the body in the shape of headache, fractured bones, dislocated joints, and so on, as directly as shame is seen in the blush rising in the cheek. This human error about physical wounds and colics is part and parcel of the delusion that matter can feel and see, having sensation and substance."

It is confessed, however, that very little progress has been made in this department:

Christian Science is always the most skillful surgeon, but surgery is the branch of its healing that will be last demonstrated. However, it is but just to say that I have already in my possession well-authenticated records of the cure, by mental surgery alone, of dislocated hip joints and spinal vertebræ.

But records, to be well authenticated, require more than an assertion. And the records may be authentic, and what they contain may never have been thoroughly tested. As they affirm that "bones have only the substance of thought, they are only an appearance to mortal mind;" if

their theories be true at all, they should be able to rectify every result of accident to the body as readily and speedily as diseases originating within the system.

*Fifth Test.* The perpetuation of youth and the abolition of death should also be within range of these magicians.

Baldwin, of Chicago, says:

"Man should grow younger as he grows older; the principle is simple, 'As we think so are we' is stereotyped. Thoughts and ideas are ever striving for external expression. By keeping the mind young we have a perfect guarantee for continued youthfulness of body. Thought will externalize itself; thus growing thought will ever keep us young. Reliance on drugs makes the mind, consequently the body, prematurely old. This new system will make us younger at seventy than at seventeen, for then we will have more of genuine philosophy."

Mrs. Eddy meets this matter in the style of Jules Verne:

"The error of thinking that we are growing old and the benefits of destroying that illusion are illustrated in a sketch from the history of an English lady, published in the London *Lancet.* Disappointed in love in early years, she became insane. She lost all calculation of time. Believing that she still lived in the same hour that

parted her from her lover, she took no note of years, but daily stood before the window watching for his coming. In this mental state she remained young. Having no appearance of age, she literally grew no older. Some American travelers saw her when she was seventy-four, and supposed her a young lady. Not a wrinkle or gray hair appeared, but youth sat gently on cheek and brow. Asked to judge her age, and being unacquainted with her history, each visitor conjectured that she must be under twenty."

That the above should be adduced as proof of anything would be wonderful if the person adducing it had not previously adopted a theory which supersedes the necessity of demonstration. It is important to notice that if the belief had anything to do with it, this amazing result grew from a belief in a falsehood. She did *not* live in the same hour that parted her from her lover; she believed that she did, and, according to Mrs. Eddy, this belief of a falsehood counteracted all the ordinary consequences of the flight of time.

But the delusion among the insane that they are young, that they are independent of time and this world, is very common; and the most painfully paradoxical sights that I have ever witnessed have been men and women, toothless, denuded of hair, and with all the signs of age—*sans* teeth,

*sans* eyes, *sans* taste, *sans* everything—some of them declaring that they were young girls and engaged to be married to presidents and kings and even to divine beings. These delusions in some instances have been fixed for many years. I have had more opportunities than were desired for conversing with persons of this class.

Granting the case adduced by Mrs. Eddy to be true, and admitting that the state of the mind may have had some effect, it is of no scientific importance; for the number that show no signs of age until fifty, sixty, or even seventy years have passed is by no means small in the aggregate; we meet them everywhere. One of the most astute observers of human nature, himself a physician, solemnly warned a gentleman that if he continued to take only four hours' sleep in twenty-four, he would die before he was fifty years of age. "What do you suppose my age to be now?" said the gentleman. "Thirty," said the physician. "I am sixty-nine," was the reply, which proved to be the fact.

Mrs. Eddy, not content with this case, continues: "I have seen age regain two of the elements it had lost, sight and teeth. A lady of eighty-five whom I knew had a return of sight. Another lady at ninety had new teeth—incisors, cuspids, bicuspids, and one molar." Such instances as these are not uncommon, but are gener-

ally a great surprise to the persons themselves, and unconnected with any delusion as to flight of time. They are simply freaks of nature.

There is a flattening of the eye which comes on with advancing years, and necessitates the use of glasses. Many persons who have few signs of age, retain the color of the cheek, have lost no teeth, and whose natural force is not abated, find their eyes dim. According to these metaphysical healers this is not necessary; but I have observed that a number of them say nothing about being themselves compelled to use glasses.

Much is made of one case of a metaphysical healer who, after using glasses fifteen years, threw them away, and can now read even in the railroad cars without them. Such cases of second sight have occurred at intervals always and under all systems, and sometimes when the progress of old age had been so great that the persons had suffered many infirmities, and had but a few months left in which to "see as well as ever they did in their lives."

Some famous actors and actresses, without the use of pigments, dyes, or paints, notwithstanding the irregular hours and other accidents of their professional life, have maintained an astonishing youthfulness of appearance down to nearly threescore years and ten.

John Wesley at seventy-five, according to testi-

mony indubitable and from a variety of sources, not only presented the appearance of a man not yet past the prime of life, but, what is more remarkable, had the undiminished energy, vivacity, melody, and strength of voice which accompany youth. Nor at eighty-five had he exhibited much change.

In the city of Chicago there died recently a professional man, nearly seventy-five years of age, whose teeth, complexion, color, hair, voice, and mind showed no signs of his being over forty-five years of age. Henry Ward Beecher, the January before his death, could write to his oldest brother that he had no rheumatism, neuralgia, sleeplessness, or deafness, was not bald, and did not need spectacles.

Meanwhile it is impossible not to suppose that the case as described by Mrs. Eddy has been greatly exaggerated. That some Americans who saw her at the age of seventy-four supposed her to be under twenty is to be taken *cum grano salis.*

As for death, if the theories of these romantic philosophers be true, it should give way: if not in every case, at least in some. It is said that there are hundreds of persons in Boston who believe that Mrs. Eddy will never die. Joanna Southcott, who arose in England in 1792, made many disciples, by some estimated at one

hundred thousand, who believed that she would never die; but unfortunately for their credulity she succumbed to the inevitable decree.

## Christianity and Health.

When Christian Science insists on love as a dominant principle in human life it is so far Christian. If the Church of Jesus Christ fails to realize love, it is so far unchristian. To the Master religion was a life ruled by love. The commandments of the Old Testament he condensed into one supreme law: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with the whole of thy heart, soul, and mind; and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It was this law that directed the heroic missionary endeavor and planted the germs of social reformation during the first three Christian centuries. Just as love led Christ to the cross, so it inspired the early Christians to the sacrifice of life, counting no gift too costly that could add to human betterment. It was the golden cord that bound the primitive Church together, and it has left its mementos in hymns of praise, in prayers, and in noble apologies for the truth, inscribed on parchments, on the walls of the catacombs, and, best of all, imbedded in the benevolent enterprises which it first inspired.

Have we now become mere traditionalists,

instead of intimate disciples of the Master? Are we so engrossed with a theory of religion that we have lost the spirit of love? If so, we have degenerated, and a power of life has parted from us without which we are desolate.

The healing efficacy of love has not only its spiritual, but also its physical, application. Christianity cannot be limited to a particular zone of human life. The salvation of the soul with reference to another world is a poor and imperfect substitute for the salvation of men in this world. The helpful ministries of Jesus were addressed to the whole man. "He fertilized human nature to its farthest borders." He had life for the soul, truth for the mind, and health for the body.

We are not surprised, therefore, to discover that Christianity has its medicinal value. Love is health-giving. When a soul escapes its narrow cell, and goes abroad in God's world profoundly stirred with human interests, when it learns tenderness and sympathy, and is employed in ministries of good, with the attention diverted from self, the restorative powers of nature are given freedom of action. The direction of the attention is of great importance to health. "The highest medical authorities agree that attention strongly directed to any part of the body will produce physical change. If the attention is

centered on the stomach, the digestion will suffer; if on the liver, that will become deranged. The vascularity of bodily organs and caliber of the blood vessels can thus be made to undergo a change. In short, the physical aspects of attention are strongly marked."[1] Selfishness is thus productive of disease and often prevents cure. It magnifies every ailment, real or imaginary.

"I know a patient," says Dr. Cocke, "who is wealthy, who has everything in the world to live for, social position, kind friends—everything. He has the opportunity to do good and to be of use in every way. He gives his money freely, but he cannot give his better self, because it does not exist. It is impossible to entertain him with anything. Books for him have no charm, the theater no fascination. Music and poetry do not reach him. The ambition to be successful in business is not his, and all in the world that he cares for, all that he cuddles and tends, are his own feelings and complaints. He cannot be reached even through the passions. Food and drink have for him no temptations. He lives in the world, bored by the things which should interest him and make his life worth living. He has tasted of everything. He has drunk of all the good things of life. He has traveled, and yet

[2] Halleck, *Education of the Central Nervous System*, p. 66.

the world has made practically no impression upon him. Loving friends have nurtured and cared for him, and he gives back only cold expressions of love for their pains. He does what he conceives to be his duty, and, in the ordinary sense of the word, he does it well. He provides for the poor, he attends church, he is connected with a great many benevolent enterprises, but love, the one thing that makes life worth living, he has never felt."

"In him ye are made full." Thus speaks the apostle, and experience as well as philosophy confirm his *dictum*. Even our personality is realized in the personality of God, and in him only can we attain perfection. The more closely we are allied to God the more perfectly we live. Perhaps our failure is in realizing the indwelling presence of God. Is God a great being in some distant part of the universe, operating in our lives only by his omniscience and power to control "second causes?" Or have we come to understand that "the power that rolls in the sea, that shines in sun and stars, that stands fast in the mountains, that utters its grace in the flower, that breaks into melody in the note of the bird, and that sweeps round man as physical environing force, is the power of the infinite will?" This is the immanent God, "in whom we live, and move, and have our being;" "who worketh in

us both to will and to work," and hence, without whom in good will life is disharmony and disease; but when we are instinct with him the deeper currents of our life divinely impelled, as are the movements of the tides or the courses of the stars, we are exalted, buoyant, resistless.

Touched by such a conception of God, the life currents course with new vigor. Schleiermacher witnesses to the exaltation it imparted to his entire being: "Unenfeebled will I bring my spirit down to life's closing period; never shall the genial courage of life desert me; what gladdens me now shall gladden me ever; my imagination shall continue lively and my will unbroken, and nothing shall force from my hand the magic key which opens the mysterious gates of the upper world, and the fire of love within me shall never be extinguished. I will not look upon the dreaded weakness of age; I pledge myself to supreme contempt of every toil which does not concern the true end of my existence, and I vow to remain forever young. . . . The spirit which impels man forward shall never fail me, and the longing which is never satisfied with what has been, but ever goes forth to meet the new, shall still be mine. The glory I shall seek is to know that my aim is infinite, and yet never to pause in my course. . . . I shall never think myself old until my work is

done, and that work will not be done while I know and will what I ought. . . . To the end of life I am determined to grow stronger and livelier by every self-improvement. . . . When the light of my eyes shall fade, and the gray hairs shall sprinkle my blonde locks, my spirit shall still smile. No event shall have power to disturb my heart; the pulse of my inner life shall remain fresh while life endures." [1]

This is communion with God in which we partake of life—blessed, eternal life. "This *is* eternal life," says Christ, not will be; a present possession, extending from the center to the periphery of human existence. All life, when once we have truly entered into it, is eternal life, and is good even in its darker experience. It is the plan of God; it is the order of nature. "When one thinks of life in man as one thing and life in God as another he has lost the key to the science of life. Nothing deserves the name of life in us that cannot be affirmed of God. Life in the soul is the tide of the divine ocean flowing as it has opportunity through the narrow channels of human nature." [2] Christ came into our world that we might "know God" in this intimate sense in all spheres of the divine self-disclosure. "I am come that ye might have life, and that ye

[1] Quoted in *Continuity of Christian Thought*, p. 400.

[2] *The Mind of the Master*, p. 76.

might have it more abundantly." Why, then, should we mistrust life? Why not live in God's world as though we believed in God and in all things that God hath made? Even here unbelief is disease, for it is a rupture with nature. He only is normal who lovingly confides in nature. This is health. Doubt antagonizes nature and is followed by abnormality and death.

"He is able to save," but how? Not by some power extraneous to nature. Not by the violation or suspension of the forces or laws of nature. We have brought confusion and uncertainty by emphasizing the "supernatural." We have created a realm for God and a realm for the devil. We have divided time and place into "secular" and "holy." We have looked for signs and wonders to supply the place of our ignorance and to cover our sin. We have expected the course of nature to be supplemented by demonstrations of omnipotence.

But the miracle, if we may use a word for which we find no equivalent in the original text, consists in leading us back to nature, in persuading us that nature is a safe guide. This Jesus did. He led us to see that all is nature, whether in the spiritual or material world, because all is under God, who is not lawless. This is true, though a law of necessity hold in the one and a law of personal freedom in the other.

Wonders and signs there may be, violations of nature never. He exalted nature. His memoirs are not a record of miracles. His own life was supremely natural. By no miracle did he provide the necessities of life. He labored at the carpenter's bench and ate the bread of human toil. He trod the dusty roads of life like other men. His whole divine life was a submission to nature in birth and joy and sorrow and death. He declared that we must be *born* again; by a process as natural as that of human generation we must be restored again to life; that we must exercise the natural power of love; that in following him we must *die* for the truth's sake. Thus we are saved by nature in accordance with divine law. "Go thou and sin no more;" restored to peace with thyself and God, preserve a life of harmony; violate no more even the least of nature's laws; be as true to nature as the flower which God arrays in beautiful garments, and enter on the endless power of a perfect life. "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Thus Jesus brings us back to nature.

Salvation by the power of nature, which is the immanent God and the immanent Christ, is not confined to the religious nor to the moral life. It is perfect and full; it is mental and moral and physical and social and political. It is curative to our sicknesses, and is even the most effective

known germicide. It is destructive to all zymotic diseases. Faith in nature, not in incantations and charms and relics and sorceries—this it is that restores us to health.

Mrs. Eddy informs us that hygiene and sanitary science are without efficiency.[1] Nature affirms the contrary. Wesley declared his faith in nature when he said, "Cleanliness is near akin to godliness." We have learned that germs of disease may float in the very air, and that epidemics may be conveyed in water. It is not faith in nature that ignores these facts; it is contempt for nature. It is akin to ascribing disease to the maledictions of Providence, and to prayer for deliverance that can only be secured by the shovel. The Mohammedans in Bombay offer long intercessory prayers that God may abate the terrible plague, but the British are securing immunity from its perils by cleansing the huts, burning or disinfecting the clothing, and isolating the sick. Now let Christian Science compete in India with sanitation and hygiene.

"In the latter half of the seventeenth century the annual mortality in London is estimated at not less than eighty in a thousand; about the middle of this century it stood at twenty-four in a thousand; in 1889 it stood at less than eighteen in a thousand; and in many parts the most recent

[1] *Science and Health*, pp. 58, 66.

statistics show that it has been brought down to fourteen or fifteen in a thousand. A quarter of a century ago the death rate from disease in the Royal Guards at London was twenty in a thousand; in 1888 it had been reduced to six in a thousand. . . . In the old Indian army it had been sixty-nine in a thousand, but of late it had been brought down first to twenty and finally to fourteen. The Public Health Act having been passed in 1875, the death rate in England among men fell, between 1871 and 1880, more than four in a thousand, and among women more than six in a thousand. In the decade between 1851 and 1860 there died of disease attributable to defective drainage and impure water over four thousand persons in every million throughout England. These numbers have declined until, in 1888, there died less than two thousand in every million. The most striking diminution of the deaths from such causes was found in 1891, in the case of typhoid fever, that diminution being fifty per cent. As to the scourge which, next to plagues like the black death, was formerly the most dreaded—smallpox—there died of it in London during the year 1890 just one person. Drainage in Bristol reduced the death rate by consumption from 4.4 to 2.3, at Cardiff from 3.47 to 2.31, and in all England and Wales from 2.67 in 1851 to 1.55 in 1888.

"What can be accomplished by better sanitation is also seen to-day by a comparison between the death rate among the children outside and inside the charity schools. The death rate among those outside in 1881 was twelve in a thousand; while inside, where the children were under sanitary regulations maintained by competent authorities, it has been reduced first to eight, then four, and finally less than three in a thousand."[1]

We have here an illustration of nature's power to aid us when we seek her. Rudiments of a gospel of mercy are to be found in nature, and the healing art has its place among them. Scientific medicine is a thing of recent years, and while theological prejudice did much to retard its early growth, the time has now come when the student of nature's mysteries is free to pursue his investigations. Already the results are startling. A well-conducted hospital is a demonstration that modern medicine is a genuine curative agency. He who observes the process by which a body torn and broken into pulp is shaped and fashioned again by the surgeon's skillful hand, the rapid healing by the use of antiseptics, and the restoration to health by remedies judiciously applied as aids to nature, cannot say, "This might better have been done by the orisons of priests or by some theurgy of faith."

[1] White, *Warfare of Science*, vol. ii, p. 91.

The modern physician must have wide culture and a well-balanced mind, with the resources of nature at his command. He has become an indispensable factor of society. Nothing could be more irrational than the substitution of self-treatment or quackery for the services of a skillful physician in a case of real need. And yet self-treatment is one of the most common evils. It is said that more than 10,000 men, who receive collectively more than $4,000,000 per annum in salaries and wages, are engaged in manufacturing patent medicines. We surely have faith in drugs, and it stands as an index of our indolence and of our lack of faith in life. We neglect the laws of life; we forget that health demands simple fellowship with nature; we set upon a course of defiance of nature, maintaining ourselves with drugs. Little wonder we break down the defenses of health and bring remedies into ill-repute. When we have exhausted the pharmacopœia the same indolence and aversion to nature leads us to hunt for some magic means of cure, some necromancy, theurgy, some fountain of life. Alas! in the end it is futile; there is but one way, we must return to nature as obedient children; we must believe in nature and do the works of faith.

There is a passage often quoted from Paracelsus, as follows: "Whether the object of your faith be false or real, you will, nevertheless, ob-

tain the same effects. Thus, if I believe in St. Peter's statue as I would have believed in St. Peter himself, I would obtain the same effects that I would have obtained from St. Peter; but that is superstition. Faith, however, produces miracles; whether it be false or true faith, it will always produce the same wonders." The truth of this observation is confirmed by the modern miracle worker. A true faith, however, like a faith in God, is better than a false faith, though many of the results may be similar. A false faith can never exalt character, and hence cannot be ethically best for the body. Hence it is important that in the search for an object of faith that will heal our sicknesses we should not adopt one that will degrade the soul.

"And he did not many works there because of their unbelief." The want of faith cribbed the power of the Master. Much as suffering men needed him, the subtle bond of union, the medium of life, was wanting. No mighty works, whether material or spiritual, have ever been wrought without faith. There is a limit to "understanding," but "faith is the evidence of things unseen."

Faith in *ourselves* is indispensable, and it should arise from the acquisition of self-knowledge, and because we have learned that man is the crowning product of the ages, the masterpiece of God. The Christian life grows out of such a

faith, as when the prodigal remembered that in *his* father's house there was abundance. He who realizes his divine ascent can no longer live in the far country. Thus it is the want of faith that benumbs, that stifles us; we pause not to think of what we are, of the sublime potentialities stored within us, of our exalted origin and destiny. Were all this real rather than an empty commonplace or an Arabian fiction; were it a faith like that of Columbus in search of a new world, it would blight every evil thought in the bud.

Guyau, in his *Education and Heredity*, speaks thus of faith as a power in the right determination of life: "When we say to a (hypnotized) subject, 'You cannot move your arm,' we paralyze the motor current that sets the arm in motion. Hence I think we can establish the following law: Every manifestation of muscular or sensory activity does not take effect unless accompanied by a certain belief in oneself, or by the expectation of a determinate result, on the occurrence of certain antecedent conditions. The consciousness of action is thus partly reduced to the belief that one is acting, and if this belief is destroyed, the consciousness itself becomes disorganized. All conscious life is based on a certain self-confidence. . . . Suggestion is the introduction within us of a *practical belief* which is spontaneously realized; the moral art of suggestion may,

therefore, be defined *as the art of modifying an individual by persuading him that he is, or may be, other than he is.* This art is one of the most important appliances in education. All education, indeed, should be directed to this end to convince the child that he is *capable of good and incapable of evil*, in order to render him actually so; to persuade him that he has a strong will, in order to give him strength of will; to make him believe that he is morally free and master of himself, in order that the idea of moral liberty may tend to progressively realize itself." Thus it is true in every part of our life that nothing palsies like doubt, nothing adds to our motor power like faith. Without faith in self the true end of life can never be attained. Vegetation only is possible, not health.

Faith in *man* will keep before our minds the good in man; we shall, therefore, think less of the bad. Familiarity with the images of evil is not conducive to physical well-being; so far we agree with Christian Science. Pictures of vice deprave the whole man. A perfect ideal before the mind sweetens the fountain of life, which will react gratefully on the whole body. Thus Christ becomes a source of health to us. He stands before us the ideal of manhood; communion with him is a vision of the good; he brings us into touch with the best in man. To avoid evil we

need not shun men; we may see them from the archetypal point of view; we may interpret them mentally; under the integument we may see the expanding Christ-life in our humanity.

Faith in nature is the medium of communion with nature. Thoreau knew the mysteries of the woods because he had faith in nature. For the same reason John Burrows knows the birds. Living in close rooms is a violation of nature. Foul gases were not made for the lungs. In the open fields, where sweet flowers bloom; on the hillsides, among the rocks and trees, by the side of rippling brooks and foaming cascades, where the warmth and cheer of sunlight are spread on everything, there is nature and there is health. He who has faith in nature will often find her quiet nooks and "look through nature up to nature's God." Nor will God be far away. There is in nature what is known as the *vis medicatrix naturæ*. It is the tendency of nature to health, the healing power of nature. Many diseases tend to recovery. Many "supernatural" cures are traceable to this power; but because they are natural shall we, therefore, say it is not the work of God? Much rather let us regard it as the immanent God thus manfesting his goodness who finds the faithful child of nature the most susceptible of his beneficent operations. Faith in nature opens the way to the *vis medicatrix naturæ*.

Faith in *God* harmonizes life. To believe in the moral purpose running through all things, the ground of progress and ultimate perfection, is to discard pessimism and to lift up the head with undying courage. A true optimism builds up the red blood corpuscles. Life is a failure without hope; the body wanes under despair. Hope helps the physician's remedies, hastens convalescence, wards off disease, and turns the attention from self to a bright and cheerful future.

Faith, hope, love—this is Christianity's contribution to our physical welfare. In a large sense health starts from the spiritual center. Disease there means disease throughout the entire organism. A faithful, hopeful, loving spirit tends to obedience, courage, perseverance, patience, cheerfulness — graces indispensable to health. Materialism has engulfed too many physicians. They have little use for spirit; their dependence is drugs. To them life is a chemical product; they deal with nothing that the scalpel does not disclose. Possibly Christian Science, theosophy, and kindred movements are a nemesis visited on our neglect of spiritual realities and our practical denial of our universal relations. Christianity has been too largely devoted to self-introspection, to unhealthy attention to states of feeling, to insuring for eternity without regard to time. Hence we have become sordid and earthy,

the sorrows and ailments of the world have grown upon us, while the spirit of healing has been restrained.

The Church as the head of Christianity ought to fill the nerve centers of the world with the power of the spiritual life and transfigure this material age with the glory of spirit. Is it not true that "the law of life has been from the beginning the law of an increasing spiritualization of matter?" As Professor Smyth continues: "Life, in all its ascending power, beauty, and worth, has been a continual access of spirit to the creation. There is no profounder or more comprehensive conception of evolution than that afforded by the law of the increasing fitness and service of the material to the spiritual." The mission of the Church is to accelerate this process, and failure at this point would unfit it to be the depository of the sublime teachings of Jesus Christ.

A Chistian church ought to be a congregation of healthy minds. This should be one of the notes of the church. The atmosphere of its auditorium should inspire normalcy of mind and body. The exalted themes of its pulpit, unclouded by dark forebodings of the future and prophecy of defeat, should be filled with the beauty and sacrifice and perfection and victory of Christ. From such a place one should go forth

with a soul full of aspiration and right impulses. Its pews should be coveted for the very sanity and buoyancy of the environment. It ought to be the world's sanitarium, its influence conspiring with all of nature's curative processes.

"Heal the sick" is Christ's command to the Church. Medical therapeutics touches only one side of the patient's need. Christianity must treat the ethical side. In the case of insanity, especially in its earlier stages, physicians encourage the rational and mental power that still remains; they seek to strengthen the will and the power of self-control. This is the side of man that Christianity should maintain in health. He who fails to realize sanity and harmony of life in the teachings of Jesus Christ misinterprets their spirit and their aim. Did not Christ give us the most exalted conception of man? Was not every man in his sight of priceless value, and worthy to live his life at its best, even on the physical side? It was his inspiration that founded the first hospital in the fourth century, an institution that has come to stand for the true interpretation of Christ's command. For centuries the Church of Rome has joined the church and the hospital, and the Protestant world is now awaking to the duty it also owes in the relief of disease. The *worth of man* is a conception of this age that is affording the largest opportunity

to every human being. Every obstacle must be removed; twisted bones are straightened, poisoned blood is cleansed, that a human being may have the largest possible chance to live the life of a man.

---

STRONG is the contrast between Christianity and Christian Science. There is little hope to a sin-sick world in a God who fades before the soul like the colors in the evening clouds; in a mortal mind so "cribbed, cabined, and confined" that it has only the most attenuated views of life; in the negation of sin and the denial of evil, two bold facts in human life; in that perversion of truth that makes the cure of physical disease the key to spiritual harmony; that reduces Christ to a doctor of the body; that treats our human ailments by creating a mental delusion; that, in brief, is only an American Buddhism.

On the other hand, the old truth of the Gospel holds a more commanding place in the world today than ever in the past. There *is* evil in the world, but Christ has come to conquer it by struggle, by sorrow, by death. He is not far separated from the world, but is immanent in human life, still struggling, suffering, dying, and rising again, and through this very ministry he is mediating the divine life to the world. God *is*

a person too infinite to be separate from an atom of matter, and yet so transcendent that he cannot be measured by the sum of all things that exist. He made man a personality capable of reducing his very soul to chaos, or of cooperating with God in building a world, and hastening the operations of divine love and power. He has left man to work out his own salvation, a task that man is steadily accomplishing in the systematic methods of science. He has opened the world before us to be conquered by intelligence, a conquest in which man is to rise into strength and moral beauty, into harmony and communion with God.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: April 2006

**Preservation Technologies**
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 017 660 857 2